LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BX6331 Copyright No. .....

Shelf .R3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CHURCH DISCUSSION:

BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES.

THE RAY AND LUCAS DEBATE.

Address, ELDER D. B. RAY, *La Grange, Missouri,*
FOR BOOKS AND AGENCIES.

17332a

"Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife."—REV. xxi. 9.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS COPYRIGHT 1873 7731

CINCINNATI:
Published for the Author.

GEO. E. STEVENS & CO.,
PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS.
1873.

BX6331
.R3

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873,
By D. B. RAY,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Stereotyped by
OGDEN, CAMPBELL & COMPANY,
176 Elm St., Cin., O.

PREFACE.

It is universally known and admitted that, in the scientific world, *discussion* has proved to be one potent means for the development of *truth*. And it is generally conceded, Catholics excepted, that so long as men differ so widely in regard to the commands of our Saviour, the church of Christ, and even the plan of salvation, religious discussion is right and necessary. And if it is legitimate to debate our differences through the pulpit and the press, such discussions surely can not be wrong when conducted in the presence of a living audience. Religious discussions for past centuries have generally turned on the points of doctrine and ordinances; but it appears that the time has come for "the battle of the churches." The conflict is no longer confined to a doctrine, or rite, or ceremony in religion, but it is now the grand question of *church identity*. The timid may shrink from the contest, but, nevertheless, it is upon us, and must be met. We now offer to the public, in the following work, the only real *Church Discussion* in the form of a debate now in print. *What is the Church of Jesus Christ? and where is it to be found?* are questions which must deeply interest every lover of truth. "Come and see," is the inspired invitation.

The Disputants, ELDER D. B. RAY, fourth son of Dennis Ray, was born in Hickman County, Ky., March 30th, 1830. He was baptized upon a profession of faith in Christ (by Elder W. White), and united with the Little Obion Baptist Church, near his father's residence, on the 16th day of October, 1844. He entered the ministry in the year 1856. His ministerial labors were mostly confined to West Kentucky and West Tennessee till the summer of 1870, when he removed from Humboldt, Tennessee (in which state he resided near ten years), to become associated with President A. S. Worrell, as editor of the *Baptist Sentinel*. Elder Ray has, since this discussion, removed from near Lexington, Ky., to La Grange, Lewis County, Mo., where his correspondents will address him. Elder Ray is the author of the TEXT-BOOK ON CAMPBELLISM, which has reached the *sixth* edition. He is also the author of the BAPTIST SUCCESSION, which has reached the fifth edition in a very short time. Elder D. B Ray has engaged in twenty oral discussions—eight with the Methodists, and twelve with the "Disciples." Among the Methodists, he has engaged in discussion, may be named, J. B. McCutchen, of West Kentucky, Dr. Gilford Jones, of Memphis, Tennessee, Elder N. H. Lee, of

Kentucky, Elder G. H. Hays, of Kentucky, and Mr. C. W. Miller, of Kentucky. Among the "Disciples," he has engaged in discussion, may be named, Elder T. W. Caskey, of Mississippi, Elder J. E. Myles of Kentucky (though he was pastor at Clarksville, Tennessee, when he died), Sam'l A. Kelley, of Kentucky (now of St. Louis, Mo.), and Dr. J. R. Lucas, whom he has met in three discussions, the last of which is contained in this work.

DR. J. R. LUCAS, A. M., second son of Elder John B. Lucas, was born in Pennsylvania, in the year 1831. His father moved to Louisville, Ky., in 1833. Dr. Lucas has spent the most of his life, thus far, in Kentucky. He moved to Missouri about four years past. He is now located at Canton, Mo. Dr. Lucas has engaged in eight oral discussions—one with a Universalist, three with the Methodists, one with the Cumberland Presbyterians, and three with Elder D. B. Ray, of the Baptists, the last of which is contained in this work. Dr. Lucas has engaged Rev. Jacob Ditzler in discussion for fourteen days, J. R. Collinsworth for nine days, and Elder G. W. Hughey, of Illinois, for twelve days. At the time of his discussion with Mr. Collinsworth he was connected as professor with Princeton College, Ky. The degree of A. M. was conferred on Dr. Lucas by Christian University, located at Canton, Mo. He has been preaching twenty-two years.

The Church Discussion, as contained in the following work, comes out with the full sanction and indorsement of both disputants, as a faithful report of the La Grange debate.

As to the style of the work, it appears with the characteristics of an oral discussion. It does not profess to be governed by the strictest rules of rhetoric. The agreement was settled only about a week before the discussion opened.

As to the origin of the discussion little need be said. Elder Ray and Dr. Lucas were the chosen representatives of their respective brethren in a four days' discussion, which occurred at Blandinville, Illinois. This discussion, which closed on the sixth of March, led to the agreement for the Canton and La Grange debates.

The importance of the issues discussed can not be questioned. The impression which prevails with some that there is no material difference between the *Baptists* and the *Disciples* is shown to be a wide mistake. The *Church Discussion* will be of importance in locating the lines of difference between the two denominations. *We now send forth the Church Discussion with our earnest request that the reader divest himself, as far as possible, of prejudice, faithfully weigh every argument, and follow the dictates of* THE TRUTH, *whatever may be the cost.*

Respectfully,

D. B. RAY.

J. R. LUCAS.

AGREEMENT FOR DISCUSSION.

The church organization with which I (D. B. RAY) stand identified, known by my brethren as the Baptist Church, possesses the Bible characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom, of Jesus Christ.

D. B. RAY, *Affirms.*
J. R. LUCAS, *Denies.*

The church organization with which I (J. R. LUCAS) stand identified, known by my brethren as the Christian Church, possesses the Bible characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom, of Jesus Christ.

J. R. LUCAS, *Affirms*
D. B. RAY, *Denies.*

The undersigned agree to publicly discuss the above questions, in the order stated, in Canton, Mo., to begin on Monday, March 17, 1872, at 6 o'clock P.M.

We agree, in the proposed discussion, to be governed by the rules for discussion as laid down in Hedges' Logic.

Each disputant to select a moderator, and the two, thus selected, to select a President.

The opening address of each affirmant, and the immediate reply thereto, may occupy one hour; subsequent addresses may occupy half an hour; each proposition to be discussed twelve hours. On the final negative, no new matter shall be introduced.

It is understood that D. B. Ray has the privilege to have the proposed discussion reported and published; with the understanding that he (Ray) bear all the expense of said reporting and publishing, and receive all profits, emoluments, etc., arising from the right and sale of said publication. A certified copy, from the reporter, to be submitted to the disputants, and published according to the certified copy of the reporter, the disputants reserving the right to correct all grammatical errors.

Each disputant to furnish an indorsement by their respective churches, as their respective representation.

The above propositions, subject to the above rules, etc., to be discussed by us in Lagrange, Mo.; to begin immediately after the close of the discussion in Canton.

D. B. RAY.
J. R. LUCAS.

INDORSEMENTS.

At a called meeting of the Baptist Church, of Canton, Mo., the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, an agreement has been entered into between the Baptists and Disciples of this place, to have a discussion on the church issues, in order to its publication; therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this church heartily and fully indorse Elder D. B. Ray, of Kentucky, as a worthy Christian gentleman, and is fully qualified to represent us in the proposed discussion, and that we request the Disciples to come forward with their representative man, that the debate may proceed at once.

"*Resolved*, That the following indorsement from prominent ministers of Kentucky (brother Ray's native State) be presented to the people of this vicinity:

"LOUISVILLE, KY., May 13, 1872.

"We, the undersigned Baptist ministers, take pleasure in indorsing and recommending Elder D. B. Ray as a high-toned Christian gentleman, and an able and competent advocate and defender of Baptist principles and practice.

"S. L. HELM, D.D., *Pastor of East Church.*
"J. S. COLEMAN, D.D., *Mod. of Gen. Association.*
"J. M. PEAY, *Pastor of S. Carrollton, Ky.*
"J. S. GATTON, *Pastor Elizabethtown.*
"JOHN JAMES, *Pastor of Sonora, Kentucky.*"

Also, indorsements from R. T. Dillard, D.D.; Cad. Lewis, D.D.; L. B. Woolfork; A. S. Worrell, D.D., editor of *Western Recorder*; A. C. Caperton, D.D.; J. H. Spencer, D.D.; George Hunt, of Lexington, Ky.; J. M. Frost, of Covington, Ky.; W. H. Felix, Covington, Ky., together with an indorsement of his books from the denominational papers.

"CHRISTIAN CHURCH, CANTON, MO., March 16, 1873.

"WHEREAS, arrangements have been entered into between the Baptists and Christians of this place, for a discussion to be published; be it

"*Resolved*, That we, as a body, do hereby fully and unequivocally indorse Bro. J. R. Lucas, as a refined gentleman, a thorough scholar, a high-minded Christian, and in every way fully qualified to represent us in said discussion.

"Done by order of the congregation.

"D. P. HENDERSON, *Chairman.*

"O. C. CLAY, *Sec. pro tem.*"

INTRODUCTION.

LAGRANGE, MO., March 25, 1873.

The meeting was called to order by President Cook, of the Lagrange College, and Rev. Dr. Henderson offered prayer.

President Smith, of Christian University, at Canton, then said:

The gentlemen engaging in this debate agree to abide by the rules governing discussion, as laid down in Hedges' Logic. These rules are in possession of the Moderators, and we will try, to the best of our ability and judgment, to enforce them, if the necessity should arise.

The proposition for discussion this evening is, "Does the church organization with which I, J. R. Lucas, stand identified, known by my brethren as the Christian Church, possess the Bible characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom, of Jesus Christ?"

Dr. Lucas will occupy one hour in affirming the proposition. Dr. Ray will occupy one hour denying the proposition; after which there will be half-hour addresses in succession. Dr. Lucas in the affirmative.

OPENING ADDRESS BY DR. LUCAS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We appear before you to-night for the purpose of affirming and trying to establish the proposition that you have just heard read. And before I proceed to my argument in favor of the proposition, I wish to say that the proposition I believe as firmly as I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and shall labor to establish its truth in your minds by arguments that we shall draw from the Word of God. And we wish to present before your minds this thought: that things equal to the same thing, are equal to one another; and if we can show that certain characteristics and elements go to make up the church of Jesus Christ, and they together are equal to the church of Christ, and that we possess those same identical characteristics, then they can not be less now than they were in the beginning. They are equal to the church of Christ, and if we establish what we have undertaken, then our proposition is true, viz.: that the church with which we stand identified, known by my brethren as the Christian church, is, beyond all successful contradiction, the visible church, or kingdom, of Jesus the Christ.

I wish to say with regard to the proposition that there are but few terms in the proposition that need any lengthy exposition; and, indeed, none that need a very lengthy explanation. The church, as expressed in the proposition, in order that you may get it fully before your minds, I would state, is by some sometimes called Disciples, sometimes called Reformers. In the proposition it is called the Christian church—the church,

or kingdom, of Jesus Christ—the visible church or kingdom of Jesus, the Christ—the Son of the living God; and I wish to state further that we do not at all base our claims upon the idea of succession; that is, that there can be established a continuous chain, composed of links embracing each successive generation, that have existed upon the face of the earth since the establishment of the kingdom by Jesus Christ. We found not our claim upon this idea of succession; but, as before stated, if we possess the same characteristics possessed by the church of Christ at the time of its establishment, it can be no less now than it was then the church of Christ.

But, with regard to this idea of succession, Mr. Bennedict, a Baptist author—the author of the "History of the Baptists"—on page 51, expresses precisely what I wish to express with regard to succession. He says: "I shall not attempt"—with regard to the Baptist Church—"I shall not attempt to trace a continuous line of churches, as we can for a few centuries past in Europe or America. This is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim, and, of course, I make no effort to prove it. We place no kind of reliance on this sort of testimony for the soundness of our faith, or the validity of our own administrations."

This, however, is what I desire to present as expressive of the point—the point that we desire to impress upon your minds to-night. We indorse and adopt the language just read as our own language with regard to the case now before us.

And I wish to state further, before I proceed to the investigation of those Scriptures sustaining my position, that if the proposition be not true, I desire, in my inmost heart, that my worthy friend shall show its fallacy; for we should all have before our mind that motto: The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and we should realize that finally we shall stand before God, and shall give an account to the Di-

vine One, for what we shall say, and for what we do; that we must render an impartial account to that One, who can not be deceived, "who alone searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men." We should then enter upon this investigation with this solemn reflection bearing upon our minds and hearts.

Then I propose to establish at once the truth of the proposition that you have had read in your hearing to-night. And the first argument to which I invite your attention is this: Our theory of commencement is in harmony with the Scriptures on the subject of the beginning—or, in other words, is just the Scriptures on the subject—no more and no less. But, in order to establish the truth of the point now before you, and to show you that our argument is properly founded, we call your attention to a few passages which may be found in the Old Testament Scriptures, and we will read, first, from Isaiah, ii. 2, 3. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. In connection with this passage, I quote in your hearing a portion of Scripture found in Micah iv. 1, 2; almost indentically the same language: "But in the last days it shall come to pass, *that* the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of

his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

These prophesies thus present especially this truth: that the time will come when the house of the Lord, or the church of the living God shall be established—looking to the future; and when established, the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. That the establishment of the kingdom here is future no one can for a moment deny; and that Jerusalem is the place whence the law shall start, the proclamation of the kingdom of Jesus Christ shall be made, is clearly presented in these passages from the prophets.

But, in connection with these passages, we call your attention now to the great commission given by the Lord to the apostles, as recorded in Luke's record, the 24th chapter, and the 46th and 47th verses, where we have these words: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Beginning at Jerusalem, in accordance with the predictions of the prophets to which your minds have been invited. And he said unto them—Jesus unto the apostles—thus it is written; and after he had given them this commission we find recorded in the 49th verse of the same chapter, where Jesus presents to his disciples—submits his last charge and promise before he left the world: "And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."

Here, then, you discover the prophets point to Jerusalem. Jesus says that the first proclamation shall come forth from Jerusalem, or beginning at Jerusalem, and now he commands his apostles to tarry in Jerusalem until they are endued with power from on high, then the Spirit shall descend that is to qualify them for their great work, that is, to guide them into

all truth, and bring to their remembrance all things that the Lord had commanded them. But, in connection with these passages, we call your attention to Acts i. 3, 4: "To whom" —that is the aspostles—"he also shewed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with *them*, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, *saith he*, ye have heard of me."

In connection with this, we will read the 8th verse of this chapter: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Now we come to Acts ii. 1-4: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Now hear the 16th and 17th verses of the same chapter. Here the apostle Peter speaks. He says: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh."

The prophets, to which we have already referred, have declared that in the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established, and that the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and when the apostles were qualified by the descent of the Spirit for the great work assigned them by their Lord, then the proclama-

tion begins, and the fulfillment here of the prophesy of Joel is but a reference to the fulfillment of the thoughts presented in the prophesies first quoted. In the last days, here, then, Peter says, that this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel. In the last days I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and I wish to call your attention to this point, that while the prophets, looking forward, spoke of the last days, they have a reference to the same point or points of time in the use of these terms; and when we find this side of the prophets, apostles, or others, speaking of the last days, we do not, of course, suppose that they refer to the same things to which the prophets referred, though they use the same language. When they of this present dispensation speak of the last days, they speak of the winding up of this dispensation, and the introduction of one more glorious; while the prophets using those terms speak of the winding up of that dispensation to which they belonged, and the introduction of the new, or Christian, dispensation.

But we now call your attention to further Scripture in proof of the point we have now before us. We will now call your attention to the reading of Acts xi. 14, 15: "Who"—that is Peter—"shall tell thee words"—when he went to the house of Cornelius—"who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved. And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." Fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Now, we have seen that the proclamation was to begin at Jerusalem. There the Spirit was given, and here Peter fixes the time of beginning beyond all controversy, and beyond all doubt, for he says, the Holy Spirit fell upon those at the house of Cornelius, as upon us at the beginning. Very evidently having reference to the time when the Spirit descended upon them on the first Pentecost after the ascension of the Saviour in the city of Jerusalem. Peter, in the term "beginning," here re-

fers to the same thing precisely that is referred to in the commission as given by Luke, when he uses the very same term, "beginning at Jerusalem."

But we now call your attention to some other Scriptures, proving that the kingdom of Jesus Christ was not set up in the days of John the Baptist, and not until after the death, resurrection, and coronation of the Divine Lord. First, the proclamation of John the Baptist. When we turn to Matthew's record of the 3d chapter, and the beginning of the chapter, we find that the proclamation made by John was this—and that is the particular point to which I invite your attention—"The kingdom of heaven is at hand!" "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." The proclamation of the near approach of the kingdom of Jesus, the Christ, did not teach or declare in any way that the kingdom was already established. No; in John's proclamation—it was future. *It was future.* It was drawing near, according to the proclamation made by John. And, secondly, you take the first commission given to the apostles by the Saviour; that commission was confined exclusively to the Jewish people—to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It did not extend to the Gentile world, as the second great commission given to the apostles did. This commission was to every creature, but the first commission given to the apostles was confined exclusively to the Jews, and they were commanded to preach precisely the same things that were proclaimed by John, the harbinger of Jesus, the one sent forth to prepare the people for the Lord—for the reception of the Lord, and for his kingdom. The apostles were commanded to go, and, as they went, they were called upon to preach, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand"—*at hand.* And if we take the seventy, we find that they were commanded to preach the same thing—that they did preach precisely the same thing. As they went, they said, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

But we now call your attention, fourthly, to the prayer taught the disciples, as found in Matthew, the 6th chapter and 10th verse. The point in that prayer, to which we desire especially to call your attention, is this: "Thy kingdom come—thy kingdom come," and this prayer could not have been appropriate, if, indeed, the kingdom had already come, unless it can be shown that they were called upon to pray for the coming of the glorified kingdom, which we are confident can not be shown from the language in the prayer. They were called upon to pray, "Thy kingdom come," looking to the future, and now we state a fact, that in all the divine record, and in all the prayers recorded in the New Testament Scriptures since Jesus has been coronated at the right hand of the Majesty on High, this prayer has never been offered up this side of the cross. No disciple, so far as the Word of God discloses, has prayed, "Thy kingdom come." This prayer was offered on the other side of the cross, and when the time did come for the establishment of the kingdom, the time when it was established on the first Pentecost, after the ascension of the Saviour, there we say at that time this prayer was answered. The kingdom—*the kingdom* was established, according to the prayer, and according to the other passages of Scripture, to which your minds have been invited.

But we now call your attention to another class of Scriptures, as we desire to get all these Scriptures bearing upon this subject before your minds, and before my worthy friend, at as early a period as possible. We invite your minds to some Scriptures found in the record as given by the Evangelist Luke, and first, to the 27th verse of the 9th chapter. Here we have these words: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God."

There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God. Now, he is addressing the

apostles. If the kingdom had been already established, they had already seen it; for if it was at that time established, they were in it; and if they were in it, they knew that they were in it; they had seen it, and Jesus tells them that some of them would still be living at the time of the approach and at the time of the establishment of his kingdom.

"There be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God"—showing that at this time it was future and yet not far in the future—within the lifetime of some of those of his disciples that he addressed.

Second, to the language found in Luke, 12th chapter and the 31st and 32d verses: "But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you." "Fear not"—and this is the portion of the Scripture to which we especially invite your attention—"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

He had not yet given to them the kingdom, from the fact that the kingdom had not yet come, but He tells them it is His good pleasure—that it is the pleasure of the Divine Father to give them the kingdom—which shows, beyond all doubt, that the kingdom at this time was yet in the future.

Again, Luke, the 22d chapter, 29th and 30th verses: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Now, the point to which we desire especially to invite your attention is that presented in the 29th verse: "I appoint unto you a kingdom," and the word that we have here translated by the word "appoint"—diatithemai—is defined to be "covenant"—to be a promise—and this passage is referred to by those who have thus defined the word, in order to show the meaning of the word; that the word means promise—or I confer by promise—I promise unto you the kingdom, I prom-

ise you a kingdom that is yet in the future—that has not yet been established, "as my Father hath promised me so promise I you a kingdom."

And in connection with this we want to call your attention to the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and we shall commence our reading with the 6th verse of the chapter, and we will read to the 11th. Here, then, we have these words: "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight."

Now, then, here the Lord refers to the establishment of the kingdom just a few moments before he ascended to the Father to be coronated King of all kings and Lord of all lords and rulers—the King of kings, the Lord of lords—when he was to be made both Lord and Christ. Here, then, he speaks of the kingdom as not having yet been established, though it is at the moment, as it were, when he ascended to the Father, and if the kingdom had already been established and the disciples had not been cognizant of the fact, the Lord certainly would have instructed them with regard to it. But, then, they understood that the kingdom was yet future, that it was not yet established, and the Lord sustained and indorsed their idea with regard to the matter. If, at the time of the ascension of the Lord, the kingdom was not established, the conclusion must force itself upon the minds of all persons that it was not established before the death of Jesus; it was not established while he was personally here, and it

was not established in the days of John the Baptist. It could not have been, and the language and the facts here presented be true.

And now we call your attention to the passage found in Luke, 19th chapter, reading from the 11th to the 16th verses, and that is explanatory of all the passages already presented: "Then came the first, saying Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities."

But the passage to which we desire especially to call attention is this: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom." That a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive the kingdom, and that nobleman we all agree—and there will be no controversy between my worthy friend and myself with regard to this point—that that nobleman represents the Lord—the King of kings, the Lord of lords—and as the point is presented that he went into a far country to receive the kingdom, it shows that that kingdom had not been received prior to his going away. This the parable clearly represents. Therefore the kingdom was not established before he went away, and after he had gone to the Father and was coronated at the right hand of the Majesty on High, the King of kings and Lord of lords, according to the promise of the Father, he receives his kingdom, and he thus establishes that kingdom among his disciples, according to his promise to them; and he rules now, and will rule and reign until all enemies are put under his feet; until the kingdoms of this world shall be subdued; until his reign shall be recognized; until he shall, even by the kingdoms of the world, be regarded as the great and glorious Lord in the Universe of God.

But we now desire to call your attention, sixthly, to language found in Matthew's record, xvi. 15-20. The Saviour

there asked the disciples: "Who do men say that I am?" This is the question he propounds; and they answer: "Some say John the Baptist, some Jeremias, some Elias, and some one of the prophets."

But he presents the question directly to them: "But who do *you* say that I am?" Peter answers: "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." Jesus responds: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona"—the son of Jonah—"for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven; and I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." All at once concede that the term rock here is used figuratively, and that it stands for Jesus the Christ, the son of the living God; that it represents him, that it stands for him in the passage, and consequently we have it affirmed, departing from the figure, that upon Christ as the foundation the church shall be built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against the great and the glorious foundation—the rock upon which the church is builded.

My friend and I differ with regard to our understanding of this passage. He says that the pronoun "it" stands for "church." My position is that it stands for the rock upon which the church is built; that it stands for the foundation or rock upon which the church of Jesus Christ is made to rest. Build upon this rock, or upon this foundation, and this foundation is of such a nature, or of such a character, that the very gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

I wish to say, however, this, while this passage is before your minds, that, grammatically, the pronoun may stand either for rock or church; that it would be just as correct, grammatically, to make it stand for one as the other, and I presume this will not be denied by my worthy friend; that, grammatically, church or rock there might be made the antecedent of the pronoun "it." And while the pronoun may stand for

either the one or the other, grammatically, we must make our appeal to other Scriptures, in order to ascertain and determine fully and clearly the antecedent of the pronoun.

We should have stated first, that Dr. Clark, and a number of others that we might introduce, take the same position that we have taken here upon this subject; and we shall see, when we come to investigate the Word of God (the 7th chapter of the prophesy of Daniel) we have "it" clearly taught "That the beast made war against the saints, and prevailed—that the beast made war against the saints, and prevailed;" and in the 13th chapter of the revelation made to John, the beloved disciple, while upon the isle of Patmos, it is there affirmed that the beast made war against the children of God, and overcame *them*. Well, then, if it be true that the beast prevailed against the disciples of Jesus, and against the saints, and overcame them, and if it be true that there is something—and evidently there is something presented here in this passage that can not be prevailed against, as the beast prevailed against the saints, as the beast overcame the children of God—and as the passage says that the gates of hell shall not prevail against *it*, it must refer, not to the people built upon this foundation, but to the foundation itself—that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the rock upon which the church is founded—shall not prevail against the great and glorious foundation.

And, with this exposition of the passage before the mind, I desire to call your attention to this especial point that we have in introducing it: "Upon this rock will I build my church." Upon this rock *will* I build my church—looking to the future. It could not then have been built at that time. *Will* build it certainly, does not mean have *already* built. But it looks to the future, as all these other passages, "I will build my church upon this foundation"—and this certainly is in accordance with the prophesy of Isaiah, as found in the 28th chapter, where Jesus is called "the foundation stone," and "chief corner

stone," and "tried stone," and he could not be represented as the foundation here upon which the church is built, until he has been tried—until he has become a "tried stone." I ask you how was he tried? We all answer that he was tried when he suffered poverty; that poverty he endured on earth when he said: "The foxes have holes, the birds have their nests, but the son of man hath not where to lay his head."

He was tried in the garden, when he then sweat the sweat of blood; when he raised his voice to the Eternal Father; when he exclaimed "my soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;" "O, Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done." He was tried when before Pilate's bar; when the mock robe was placed upon him; when he was lacerated with the Roman scourges; when he wore the crown of thorns, his tender temples being pierced with the thorns, which the crown contained. He was tried there, he was tried upon Calvary's rugged mount, when his tender hands were nailed to the cross; when his feet were spiked fast to it; when his side was pierced; when he shed his blood; when he bowed his head and died, after having exclaimed to the Father: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

This was the "tried stone." This was the chief corner stone tried, and he, having endured all this, in connection with his temptation while in the world, and the temptations that Satan brought, he became the "tried stone," and, consequently, is presented as the foundation, tried and secure upon which the church is made to rest. Upon this foundation, "I will," says Jesus, "build my church."

But I call your attention, seventhly, to language found in Eph. ii. 11-17. And here we have it, I think, very clearly presented, that the kingdom of Jesus could not have been established; the church could not have been set up in the days of John, nor during the personal ministry of the Saviour; could

not have been established prior to the death of the Son of God. In this passage, then, the closing part of the second chapter of Paul's letter to the Ephesians, you have these words: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*. Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace."

Now, here it is affirmed by the passage that the middle wall of partition, between the Jew and the Gentile, was broken down, was taken away by nailing it to the cross. It was destroyed in his flesh in the death of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God, and when this partition wall was taken away, then of the twain one new man was made, so making peace. Here was one body—one new body, one new man, and every authority that I have ever consulted upon the subject—and I have examined quite a number—take the position that this one new man, that this one new body, was one new church—was one new church—the body of Christ—the church—the church of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Now, the point that we make here upon this passage is this: That if this one new man, this one new body, this one new church, was not made until after the middle wall of partition was taken away in the death of Jesus, by being nailed to the cross, then it could not have been made, it could not have been established, it could not have been set up, before the death of the Son of God; but must have looked to a period this side of his death, and that period we have shown from the

prophesies, and from Luke's record of the commission, and from other Scriptures, looked to Jerusalem as the place, and the time when it was established was when the apostles were qualified and endued with power from on high to present the claims of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God; to organize his church, God's kingdom, to establish it in the world, and then, according to Peter, the beginning is dated. "Conferred upon them as upon us, at the beginning," looking to Jerusalem as the place.

And now, with regard to the subject of beginning, I will call your attention to these Scriptures, and I wish to read the testimony of a few Baptist authors upon the same point, showing that they understand this subject, so far as the beginning of the church and the establishment of the church is concerned, precisely as we have presented it for your consideration to-night.

Turn to Duncan's History of the Baptists, page 32, where you have these words: "The first —— church established among the Jews was at Jerusalem, according to the model of which the other churches, subsequently formed among the Jewish people, for the most part conformed."

Now, he says this was the first; this was the first established under the administration of our adorable Lord at Jerusalem, and, until others were established, this one was emphatically the church of Jesus Christ. It was the church of Jesus Christ, and embraced the members of the church of Jesus Christ, until its spread—until others were formed.

But we not only call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Duncan upon this question, but to other passages upon the same subject, where the same point is presented—is acknowledged. I will next quote the testimony of Mr. Jones, who has written an extensive church history, who is also a Baptist, and Mr. Orchard says he has furnished the world with the best, the finest history of the church that ever has been

given to the world, until the one that he presents makes its appearance in the world. Thus he speaks of Jones' history, and he says on page 70 (this is more Baptist testimony upon the same subject) :

"As the church at Jerusalem was the first Christian church," and now there are two points to which I invite your attention here. The first is, that he says this was the first church, and not only so, but he says it was the first *Christian* church. He calls it by the name "Christian church"—"It was the first Christian church established by the ministry of the apostles, so it was designed to serve as a model to all succeeding churches to the end of the world."

And Orchard, a Baptist historian, makes the same statement; and I want to call your attention now to the statement of Neander, a historian acknowledged as one possessed of largeness of mind and of great information, a man occupying an exalted position in the intellectual and religious world. He uses these words, on page 7: "It is because that great event was prefigured and prepared for, and was accomplished at the time of the first Pentecost"—the first Pentecost after the ascension of our Lord—"was prefigured and prepared for, and was accomplished at the first Pentecost celebrated by the disciples after the Saviour's departure, that this feast is of so great significance as marking the commencement of the first apostolic church."

Then we have given you, upon this subject, Isaiah; we have given you Micah; we have given you Joel; we have given you Matthew; we have given you Luke; we have given you Jesus; we have given you the apostles; and, then, in addition to all these, we have given you Duncan, and Orchard, and Jones, who are Baptist historians, and Neander, of high authority in the religious world, and they sustain the position that we have attempted to maintain—that the beginning of the church—that first church—the first church was established

at Jerusalem, on the first Pentecost after the ascension of our Lord. And, then, we feel that we are right in regard to our first argument—that we are right upon the subject of beginning—the theory concerning the beginning of the kingdom of God, or the church of Jesus Christ.

But we call your attention to the second argument. We aver that we are identical with the primitive church upon this subject of the foundation. The foundation upon which the church was reared, according to the teachings of the apostles of Jesus, was Jesus the Christ. "Upon this rock will I build my church"—in accordance with the prophesy of Isaiah already referred to. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S FIRST REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN, MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED CONGERGATION: I stand in your presence, denying, emphatically, the proposition which has been read and discussed and attempted to be proved by my worthy friend. It affirms that the organization with which he stands identified, known by his brethren as the Christian Church, is the visible church, or kingdom of Christ.

It is certainly a proposition of great interest; and, according to the doctrine of his church, one that involves the salvation of the human family; because I expect to show, in the progress of the investigation, that he contends that out of the church is no salvation. Then it behooves us to search—to seek diligently for that organization known as the church of Christ.

I do not, however, indorse his position that salvation is to be found alone in the kingdom of the Saviour. We agree that there is a kingdom—a church of the living God; and we agree in the proposition that the term "church" is not used in its primary sense, having reference to a local congregation, but in the larger sense, embracing the idea of kingdom. Whether we are authorized from God's Word to use the term in this sense or no—it is so defined in the proposition—"church or kingdom."

My friend seems to have forgotten the definition of the proposition.

Before I enter this investigation, I desire to call your attention especially to several passages of Scripture, establishing

the perpetuity, or succession, if you please, of the organization known as the kingdom of Christ. This has been denied in the speech to which we have attentively listened; and he admits that if the succession of the church is proved as certain—is established—then his proposition must fail; at least I understood him in the former discussion so to admit, and also to-night. *That the kingdom of Jesus Christ has continued from the time of its establishment until now,* I offer the following proofs: Your attention is first invited to the prophesy of Daniel ii. 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." In the 35th verse of the same chapter: "And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

It is affirmed in this prophesy, this declaration of God's unchanging word, *that the kingdom shall never be destroyed.* This does not mean it shall be destroyed. It means what it says. It is affirmed that it *shall stand for ever.* This can not be interpreted that it will come to an end; and that same stone that was cut out without hands, which smote the image and destroyed it, was at last to become a great mountain and fill the whole earth. That stone will not cease to exist from its first evolution upon the earth, until it fills the whole world. This in itself would establish the truth of the proposition that the kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom.

Second proof: We call your attention to 1st Tim. iii. 15: "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." I quote this to show that the church is called a house of God, *the* house of God—is called His church. This was admitted by my worthy friend. And, then, in Is. ii. 2, which you have

heard, we have the following: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills." This is the same *Lord's house* mentioned by Paul to Timothy—not another house; not one similar to it; but this *same* house of the Lord is to be established in the tops of the mountains—above human governments—and nations shall flow unto it.

As a third argument, we introduce Dan. vii. 27, the same chapter referred to by my friend: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom *is* an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." This is in the same chapter where it is said (21st verse), "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them." But this papal horn, anti-christ, did not prevail against the kingdom. There is a difference, the Doctor should have known, between individual saints that were prevailed against and slaughtered along the dreary path of ages, and that everlasting kingdom that should stand for ever. It is nowhere declared in God's Word, that the church or the kingdom shall be destroyed or prevailed against.

My fourth proof under the head of the perpetuity of the church, is Mat. xvi. 18: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." As has been already stated, we differ as to the pronoun "it." The gates of hell shall not prevail against *it*. He supposes the word "it" to refer to rock. But the gates of hell may prevail against the church! Suppose that I dig deep and lay the foundation of a house upon a rock, and affirm, that "the storms of coming years shall not prevail against it," who would for a moment suppose that I was talking about the rock down

there being prevailed against? How absurd is the position taken; and it seems to me that the pressure of circumstances has forced the interpretation. I wish your attention to a very forcible illustration on this subject, found in Mat. vii. 24: "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock." It seems to me that he might just as well apply the pronoun "it" here to the rock, when it says *it fell not*, as to apply the pronoun "it" of Mat. xvi. 18, to the "rock." Whoever supposed there was danger of the gates of hell prevailing against Jesus Christ?

Another argument is based upon the great commission as given by Mat. xxviii. 19, 20: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world." This public preaching and baptizing was the work of the church of the living God; this promise has reference to the church. Jesus says, "lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world." Here the doctrine of the perpetuity and succession of the church is affirmed and promised by the Son of God himself.

My sixth proof is found in Luke i. 33. The angel announced to Mary the birth of a saviour, whose name should be called JESUS, and affirmed "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The double expression "for ever" and "no end" is found here, and if the angel of God had intended to teach the perpetuity of the church, he could not have found language to indicate it stronger than is found here. In our former discussions the Doctor has failed to notice this passage and give an

answer, as far as I remember now. I wish him to note that especially.

My seventh proof text upon the perpetuity of the church is found in Hebrews xii. 28: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.' "Receiving a kingdom which can not be moved," that kingdom is as immovable as the rock upon which it is founded. It is placed upon the rock Jesus Christ, and the storms have beat upon it; the rains of persecution have descended, and the floods of opposition have beat against it, and it *fell not*—it was founded upon a rock.

Again, my eighth proof text is 1st Cor. xi. 26: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." It is understood that the Lord's Supper is an institution in the kingdom of Christ, observed by the church of Christ, and I understand the apostle here to predict that this eating and drinking in the kingdom of God would be done until he come. From that time until now it has been observed, and will be till he comes. There is none except the church has a right or can possibly observe the Lord's Supper. It is done in and by the church in fellowship. If a man with these proof texts will deny the perpetuity of the kingdom of God, I will say in the language of Abraham, that "he would not be persuaded though one should rise from the dead." How can a man stand up and contradict Almighty God and the truth of His word? There are passages then that will not admit of being explained away. Let us, therefore, be careful.

I will call your attention to some authorities from the gentleman's church. First, is Tolbert Fanning. In a little work called "Searching the Scriptures," page 95, he says: "We rejoice also to know that for more than 1800 years, this kingdom has stood as a city on a hill, with doors open to all who

would enter the fold of Christ." Thus affirming the doctrine of the Bible, that the kingdom for 1800 years has stood. Then we have the testimony of Mr. Errett, in a little work called "Elements of the Gospel," page 40: "This brings us to the day of Pentecost, and its most significant developments as narrated in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Here we reach our point of rest. Here is the grand culmination of the scheme of salvation. Here is the setting up of the kingdom. Here is seen the little stone cut out of the mountain which Nebuchadnezzar saw, and which is yet to become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth."

I have thus given you what a prominent writer of the gentleman's church declares, concerning that stone, or kingdom, that was established, he thinks, upon the day of Pentecost. I do not indorse that part of his statement. He says that stone is yet to become a great mountain, and fill the whole world.

Again, I have the testimony of Mr. Benjamin Franklin, in "Living Pulpit," a standard work of the denomination, containing 28 sermons, I believe, of leading men. Mr. Franklin says, p. 343, that "A community not founded at the right time, is not the kingdom of Christ;" p. 350, "Popery was inaugurated too late, by at least three centuries, to be the true and genuine church. If popery was born too late, or is *too young* to be the true church, what shall be said of those communities born in the last three centuries?"

Again, Mr. Tolbert Fanning ("Living Pulpit," page 520), says: "The church was built upon the rock laid in Zion; that she has withstood the rough waves of eighteen centuries; and that she will, finally, triumph gloriously over all the principalities and powers of earth."

Again, John A. Brooks, in the debate with Mr. Fitch, held in Winchester, Ky., affirmed in debate proposition fifth, that "the church, known at this day as the Disciples, or

Christian Church, is the church which was established on the day of Pentecost."

And so a large majority of authorities, drawn from his own church, sustain the Bible position, which is, that the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ has stood until now, and will stand until the Son of God shall come a second time.

I call your attention to one more authority, that is from that eminent man, Alexander Campbell, who was the father and founder of the gentleman's church. He says, in reply to a conscientious sister (Millenial Harbinger," new series, vol. 1, page 411, 12): "If there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans, and, therefore, no Christians in the world, except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus; therefore, for many centuries there has been no Church of Christ, no Christians in the world, and the promises concerning the *everlasting kingdom of the Messiah* have failed, and the *gates of hell have prevailed against his* church. This can not be, and, therefore, there are Christians among the sects." Alexander Campbell affirms that the gentleman's position can not be true—impossible; and, I would state, dear friends, if all history was a blank, if from the time the canon of Revelation was closed, from that time till now was one vast chasm of darkness, and not one line to light up the dreary ages of the past, with the prophetic word in hand, I would span the chasm and say, *the gates of hell have not prevailed against the church.* It has weathered the storms of eighteen centuries, and will stand at last, when Jesus comes.

I proceed now to call your attention more particularly to the arguments presented. I admit that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." The gentleman must not simply prove that one thing is like, or equal to another. He has undertaken to prove identity. There may be two things

equal to one another, but they may not be identically the same. He has not simply to prove that his church resembles the original church. His proposition affirms that it is "*the* church, or kingdom, of Christ." He is very tender upon the question of succession, and refers to the Baptist author and historian, Mr. Bennedict, on page 51, in regard to succession. I will state that Mr. Bennedict does not deny the existence of succession, and, just where the gentleman quit reading, I will read: "But the more I study the subject, the stronger are my convictions that if all the facts could be disclosed, a very good succession could be made out." He believed that a succession existed, yet this was not his object in writing. He was not attempting to establish it. He did not think it absolutely necessary for him to establish succession, in order to establish the claims of the Baptist Church; and upon that I agree with him. But I affirm that it is essential *that the succession exist,* or there is no church of Christ on earth. Whether I establish it or not, that succession must exist. And a church without that succession, a church established by art of man's device in modern times, can not be the original one set up, even if it were set up on the day of Pentecost.

In regard to the prophesy of Isaiah and Micah about the *law going forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem,*" I will simply call your attention at the present time to one of them. It is said that "the law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem;" but when we examine the connection, we find that it is a prophesy still unfulfilled, pointing to the future, to the time when the kingdom shall be exalted. I refer to Is. ii. 2–4: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of

Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." This shows that when this prophesy is fulfilled it will be when there is no war, when the mountain of the house of the Lord shall have been exalted above the hills, above the mountains. The same is true of the statement in Micah. The passages referred to in Luke xxiv. 46, 47, 49: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

"Beginning at Jerusalem." He says that this was the first, the beginning of the preaching of the remission of sins; when upon examination he will find that it was the beginning of the gospel to the representatives of the nations; as found in Mat. x. 5, the commission was confined to Judæa: "into *any* city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But now that commission is enlarged; it is to go to the nations: and on the day of Pentecost there were Jews, devout persons out of every nation under heaven; and it began then to go to the nations, but not the first beginning of that word of God's great salvation. In proof that this interpretation is correct, I call your attention to Acts x. 36, 37: "The word which *God* sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:) That word, I *say*, ye know, which was published throughout all Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached." The preaching of the Son of God is referred to. *There* was the beginning of this salvation proclaimed. Also, Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we

escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him.*" Not first began to be spoken on the day of Pentecost by Peter, or the apostles; but "*which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord*"—by the Son of God. And in Luke iv. 16–22: "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written: The Spirit of the Lord *is* upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave *it* again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is the scripture fulfilled in your ears." That prophesy of Esaias pointing to the actual preaching of the gospel. This was in Galilee, after the baptism which John preached. He arrived in Nazareth, where he was brought up; and here he opened the gospel, and preached salvation to the captives and liberty to those that were bound. In my judgment, there can be no doubt about this interpretation.

In regard to the least in the kingdom of God being greater than John, this has nothing to do with the proposition, it seems to me. Whether John was in the kingdom or not, does not enter into the discussion. The gentleman knows that that *mikroteros* is in the comparative degree, that it is less; *he* that is *less* in the kingdom; and it is so translated by many. I want to call your attention to the testimony of the celebrated commentator Lange, in this connection. "He that is

less"—he puts least in brackets—"Meyer: Not he that is *least*, as the comparative is never used for the superlative. See Winer's Grammar (p. 218). De Wette entertains a different opinion, and translates it *least*. But the passage is so important, that unless forced by the use of the language, we are not warranted in deviating from the literal expression, though we do not deny that the rendering *he that is least* gives good sense."

And then we have the testimony of the editor, Philip Schaff, upon this subject, "*Less*, or *the lesser, ho mikroteros*. So Lange, Van Ess, the Latin vulgate (*minor*), and all the older English versions, Wiclif's, Tyndale, Crammer, Geneva (less), the Remish (*the lesser*)." The older translations render it *less* or *lesser*, while the later translations give it *least*. But, whether it has this, that, or the other meaning, as I have remarked, it does not affect the discussion, even as to the time of the setting up of the kingdom.

Again: "Thy kingdom come." He tells us that this has reference to the future, as found in Mat. vi. 10—that model prayer. Upon examination he will find that it is *elthetō* from *erchomai* in the aorist tense. Bagster, in Lexicon of the New Testament, says: "To come, to go, to pass." He gives this as the meaning. Liddell and Scott's Lexicon says: "to come, to go away, especially in the imperative." Robinson says: "to go, to come," and makes "go" the first, or primary meaning of the word. It shows, then, the sense is *prevail*, or increase. He has no right, it seems to me, professing to take the New Testament as his guide, to set aside that beautiful model prayer given by the Son of God himself.

Some standing here that shall not taste death until they see the kingdom of God come. Dr. Lucas infers from this that the kingdom had not come. I will call his attention to Mat. x. 23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not

have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Though present, he represents himself as *coming in the future*, appearing in a different character. And so I understand of the kingdom. While present as the grain of mustard seed that was sown in the field, hidden from the view of mankind, yet it was to appear at length, and come forth to the light, and to be exhibited before the world. This is confirmed again in Mark ix. 1: "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power. And after six days Jesus taketh *with him* Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them," showing that this coming was the coming with a power which had not appeared before that time. Again, Luke xii. 32: "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." The gentleman affirmed that they did not possess the kingdom. I grant this, but the Saviour himself was present, possessing that kingdom, executing its laws; but when he departed from the world he leaves with them the kingdom.

The gentleman alluded to that passage (Luke xxii. 29) where it is said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom."

But, the gentleman's definition, *to promise*, of that word *diatithemai*, is not found in Robinson, or Bagster; and, as the primary meaning, not even in Liddell and Scott, if I remember correctly; but it is used in the sense of *will* or *covenant*, as when an individual is about to depart, or to die, he *wills* his property to his heirs; and those heirs of the kingdom received it by *will*, as the Saviour was about to depart. A will is of no force while the testator liveth, but the testator is the executor of his own will, while he lives, and when he comes to die, he makes his will, and Jesus left the disciples his authority as the executors of his will; as a kingdom he left it with them to execute its laws.

But in regard to the expression, Acts i. 6: "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" the disciples were not asking in regard to the kingdom of Christ, but in regard to the kingdom or government that had been usurped by the Roman power; they had political aspirations for their own native country. Prior to this time, at the bar of Pilate, Jesus had said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." John xviii. 36.

In regard to receiving the kingdom and returning, that he went, as the parable of the nobleman says, to receive a kingdom *and return*. He has not yet returned. There are only two *comings* of Jesus Christ mentioned in God's Word. The first was when he was born of the virgin and cradled in the manger, and the second is when he shall come the second time, with power and great glory with all the holy angels; and in this returning is the time when the kingdom is to be exalted above the mountains and above the hills. If *his* argument is correct, then the kingdom is not set up yet, because he has not returned.

In regard to Jesus not being a suitable foundation until after he suffered upon the cross, I say, dear friends, that the argument savors of Unitarianism. That prior to that time he was not a suitable foundation! I learn from the precious word that he was as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world; I learn that ancient Israel drank of that spiritual rock, and that rock was the Christ; and as the rock of the salvation of ancient Israel, he was a suitable foundation. He was tried, too, on earth even before his death. He was tried when he was sorely tempted of the devil forty days and forty nights, when in the desert. Jesus Christ was a suitable foundation; he was the foundation of the church when he uttered the language to Peter: "Upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The Dr. attempts to prove that the church was not set up because this verb is in the future tense, "will build." I have the definition here of Mr. Bagster, "to construct, establish," Mat. xvi. 18. Robinson—*oikodomeō*—"*to build up, to establish, to confirm,* spoken of the christian church and its members; who are thus compared to a building, a temple of God, erected upon the one only foundation, Jesus Christ, and ever built up progressively and unceasingly more and more from the foundation." Thus showing that we are not compelled to understand that language as the beginning of the work of building up—up-building—building up progressively, as Mr. Robinson says.

As to his Baptist testimonies, as before intimated, he has misconceived the scope of their meaning. They use the term *church* as a local congregation, and affirm that the first local organization, or single organization was at Jerusalem. They said, so far as he has read, nothing about the time; they do not say the day of Pentecost, but the first local church was at Jerusalem; and so I say. They were not using the term church in the sense of kingdom—in the sense of our proposition; he ought to have observed that. So his authorities, so far as the Baptists are concerned, fail him. And his testimony of Neander upon the subject, I believe, was about the same thing.

I proceed, then, for the balance of my time, in my negative argument. According to the gentleman's own admission, his church can not possibly be a church of Christ, or the church of Christ, because it neither began with Christ, on the day of Pentecost, nor with the inspired apostles. The setting up of his church is wrong. Mr. Campbell says [Religious Encyclopedia, p. 462]: "The rise of this society, if we only look back to the drawing of the lines of demarkation between it and other professors, is of recent origin." It was lately set up—in the present century. Again [Christianity Restored, p. 6] Mr. Campbell says that "a few individuals, about the

commencement of the present century, began to reflect upon ways and means to restore primitive christianity."

Again [in the Religious Encyc. p. 463], he says that "it was not until the year 1823 that a restoration of the *original gospel and order of things* began to be plead, in a periodical edited by Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, entitled: 'The Christian Baptist.'"

Again: Mr. Campbell says in the same work, same page, that it was not until the year 1827, after the Baptists declared "non-fellowship with the brethren of the reformation," that "they were obliged to form societies out of these communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the apostles' doctrine"—on account of adherence to the apostles' doctrine. Thus showing that the organization of the gentleman's church did not begin until the year 1827; and this is a long distance from Pentecost.

Mr. Burnett, in the Living Pulpit, page 47, says: "Within the last forty-five years, a community has grown from zero to half a million." He is talking about his own church, *that within the last forty-five years* the gentleman's church has grown from *nothing*—come up from zero in that length of time. Well, you know zero, that it is in a very cold latitude.

I advance, then, in my second negative argument; that is, that the gentleman's church was not first established in Jerusalem. Mr. Ben. Franklin (Living Pulpit, page 343), says: "A community not founded and established in the right place, is not the church of Christ." Page 348, he says: "All agree that Jerusalem was the right place." Well, that is what my friend says. We are discussing about the church with which he is identified; not the one Paul was identified with, or Peter; but the church organization with which "I, J. R. Lucas, stand identified." In the "Living Pulpit" we have the testimony of the editor, Mr. Moore (page 14), thus: "This was the beginning of the great reformatory movement, known as the Reformation of the Nineteenth Century. But THOMAS

CAMPBELL and those who operated with him in Western Pennsylvania and Western Virginia, were not alone in these efforts at a restoration of Primitive Christianity. In Kentucky and Tennessee, Stone, Marshall, Thompson, Dunlevy, and others, were zealously advocating the same principles. Under the influence of these movements, which had no well-defined organization, a latent force was excited, which has taken the body and form of what is now known as the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, OR DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.

In Western Virginia and Pennsylvania, and in Kentucky and Tennessee, men *excited a latent force which has taken the form of what is known as the Christian Church*—the gentleman's church. And this writer affirms *that this was the "beginning" of this reformatory movement;* that it originated here, that it did not begin at Pentecost, neither did it begin at Jerusalem. The geography of the gentleman's church is wrong by at least *six thousand miles.* The broad Atlantic, and the Mediterranean Sea roll their mighty waves between the place of the beginning of *his church* and Jerusalem.

Argument third: His is not the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ, because it has not the Son of God as the founder and head. We have testimony that I have already read, that Mr. Campbell, Mr. Stone, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Dunlevy, and others put in motion that latent force out of which has come that body known as the Christian Church, or Disciples of Christ.

I want your attention to some proof texts in regard to the headship of the church. The Lord Jesus Christ must be the head of the visible church of Christ; and I propose to prove from his own authors, his own authority, that another besides Jesus Christ is the founder and head of his church. Memoirs of Mr. Campbell, by Prof. Richardson—an eminent writer—vol. 1, p. 401: "From the moment that Thomas Campbell concluded to follow the example of his son in relation to baptism, he conceded to him in effect the guidance of the whole religious movement." [TIME EXPIRED.]

SECOND ADDRESS OF DR. LUCAS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I can not exactly see the force of the gentleman's reply. The difficulty may be with me, however; but I would like for him to make his replies to my arguments a little plainer, at least, for he certainly has wandered around a good deal. But I wish to call your attention to some points presented by him; and where he introduces a number of passages, I must, in order to advance with my argument, allow the examination of one of a class to answer all that belonged to that particular class. I take the one with regard to the kingdom.

"The kingdom shall have no end; the kingdom shall not have an end." Well, now, while it is true that the saints of God may be overcome, prevailed against, just exactly as the prophesies declare, I presume no one entertains the idea that that will be the end of the kingdom of God, as it is represented by the two witnesses also that were killed and found lying dead in the street, unburied; but life and power returned to them, and the ultimate end will be the triumph of the kingdom of God; and yet it may be so overpowered as that the prophet and John may be justifiable in saying that they are overcome, that they are prevailed against. But the gentleman has very nearly—in my judgment, at least, and I think I can show to you that it is correct—conceded my main argument drawn from the prophesies. And now he calls your attention to 1st Tim. iii. 15, to show you that the term "house of God" means the church—the house of God referred to in the

prophesy under the subject of the mountain of the Lord's house. And, now, here Paul refers in Timothy to the same thing by the word "house." While he says that these prophesies have never been fulfilled—that they are yet to be fulfilled—and while Paul differs with the gentleman, yet Paul and the gentleman agree that they refer to the house mentioned in the prophesies. They agree upon that subject, that Paul refers to the mountain of the Lord's house that we quoted in the prophesy; and I reckon the house of the Lord was established then, because he is telling Timothy how to behave himself in the house of God that already exists, that was then established; and he will not deny that it was established then, for, very evidently, if it was established in the days of John, it was then established. But now he comes up and tells you that all these prophesies are yet to be fulfilled. Certainly, there is a little matter here that the gentleman must fix up.

But then he goes to Mat. xvi. 18, and he gives us a long discourse upon the subject of succession. As I stated, I found no argument upon the succession at all. I found no argument upon it. In the language of Benedict, I do not regard it as important that the succession shall be established. There is no importance to be attached to this idea whatever; but it is the doctrines, principles and practices that constitute the matters of importance, as we affirm, and as Benedict affirms. And if we establish identity here, if those things constituted the church of Christ when it was established and exist now, it can not be anything else than the church of Jesus Christ now.

But he gave you a case with regard to the passage, "Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Well, now, did not I say to you that, grammatically, the pronoun "it" might have for its antecedent either church or rock. Has he denied it? He has not, and

he will not, because he knows we are correct upon that subject. But we have to refer to other passages, in order to see which is to be regarded here as the antecedent of the pronoun; and the passages, to which we have referred, in my judgment, clearly establish that the antecedent of the pronoun here is rock, and not church.

But "things equal to the same thing are equal to one another." It is not equality, he says, it is not similarity, but identity. Now, then, I propose to show that things equal to the same thing are equal to one another; or, admitting this axiom, that certain characteristics are equal to the church of Christ, because they, nevertheless, when taken separately, do not constitute the church or are unequal to it, but when existing together they go to make up the church of Christ, are equal to the church of Christ when completely organized; and now, if I show that the church recognized by my brethren as the Christian Church possesses the same characteristics, and those characteristics are equal to the church of Christ as first established, we are forced to the conclusion that the very same characteristics are equal to the church of Christ now; and when I have done that I have not proven similarity, but I have proven identity. "It (the succession) must exist, my friend says, though it may not be made out," and we want you to recollect this statement of the gentleman, for we are satisfied that he will have a great deal of difficulty in making out the succession.

But, then again, "beginning at Jerusalem"—"that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem;" and then, to show the beginning, he goes where John began to preach the gospel in Galilee. Now, I wish to know if the beginning referred to there, when it is said John began to preach the gospel in Galilee, if that beginning is the same "beginning" referred to in Luke, where it is said "beginning at Jerusalem," and I

want to know if it is the same beginning; if not, it has nothing to do under the broad heavens of God with the question. And now I wish to remind you of this fact: He said that the gospel was actually preached by John at the time of the beginning referred to. Now, this I deny; and here we have an issue, right here we have a direct issue. I deny it; I say it could not be actually preached at that time, and I say it could not be actually preached until after Jesus had died, until after he was buried, until after he rose again. It could be preached by promise, but not actually; and I call your attention to the testimony of Paul, as found in the 1st Cor. xv. 1, upon this subject, the beginning of the chapter, which reads as follows: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." Now, Paul says that the gospel actually and in fact could not be preached before Jesus died, before he was buried, and before he rose from the dead. It could be preached in promise, and it was preached away back in the days of Abraham in promise; and if the gentleman is going back to the days of John, in order to find the beginning of his church, because the gospel in promise was preached, he had better go back to the days of Abraham, where the gospel was first preached in promise, and take the beginning of his church there. But he will not do that. His brethren do not believe that at all. But if he is going after the gospel in promise, he had better go clear back to the beginning of the preaching of the gospel by promise, and that was in the days of Abraham, as Paul asserts in his letter to the Galatians.

"But that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Now, I submit this proposition, that repentance and remission of sins never was preached in the name of Jesus, as the Christ, until the first Pentecost, after his ascension. Now, let him convict me of error here if he can. I say it could not be preached in his name as the Christ until he was made the Christ; he was not constituted and anointed the Christ on earth. Peter affirms in the Acts of the Apostles, after he ascended to the Father, that "God hath made him both Lord and Christ." He made him Lord and Christ in heaven, and not on earth. But what Jesus did he did not in his own name, he asserts; but he did in the name of the Father; and, consequently, what was done up to the time of his ascension and coronation at the right hand of the Majesty on High, was not done in his name as the Christ, was not done in the name of the Christ, and the very first time that remission of sins was preached and presented in the name of Christ and the gospel preached in fact, was on the first Pentecost after the ascension of our Lord. Now, then, hear the gentleman and we have an issue again, and let him show that we are wrong upon this subject.

But, "least in the kingdom." In the majority of cases where this word occurs (*mikros*) we find that it is used in the comparative degree; that is, the original is in the comparative degree, but not in the translation; that it is in a majority of these occurrences translated as we have it here with regard to John the Baptist, in the superlative, because they can translate it in no other way to convey the idea—the idea of the original author of the language. The least of seeds, the less of all seeds, would not do, but now just admit the Baptist authority to which he has referred—he says least or less, and he refers to some authors that favor the translation least—that favor this translation; and his own author says "it certainly would

make very good sense to translate it least;" and certainly it would make it very good sense to translate it least. But, then, if it is not true, it would neither make it good sense nor good Bible to translate it least; and from the fact that it will make good sense to translate it least, is proof that it is consistent with the Bible and *with truth.*

The gentleman would like to get away from this rendering—namely, that others born of woman are greater than John, and the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he, and as John was the greatest ever born of woman among the prophets, according to the declaration, and yet the very least in the kingdom is greater than John; I ask you, now, what idea does this language force upon your minds? If the kingdom existed, John was in it, and John knew it; and so did the Saviour know that John was in it. And I ask you, now, how, can it be possible that John could be *the* greatest born of woman in the kingdom, and yet he that was least in the kingdom was greater than the greatest. Now, there is the trouble, and my friend sees it, and, consequently, he will labor to make the impression on your minds that it has nothing to do with the question at all. "Why, that has nothing to do under the broad heavens with the question." He can not see it; no, there is trouble ahead, there is trouble ahead. It shows clearly that the kingdom did not then exist.

Now, suppose you take his word least just as he renders it. John is the greatest born of woman, according to the declaration; and if the kingdom existed, John was in it. John was in it, John knew it, and the Saviour knew it; and now he has the Saviour represented as saying that John is the greatest born of woman and in the kingdom: yet he that is less than John is greater than John; consequently I can not see that the gentleman is helped any even by his rendering or by his translation. He will have to translate it again—try it over.

But he told us that when he departed he gave to them the

kingdom—when he departed. Well, the gentleman is getting on by degrees; we are getting him nearer and nearer Pentecost every debate we have. The first one, he was away off from Pentecost, and the second one he got a little nearer, and now we have him still a little nearer yet. Now he says, that he gave them the kingdom—that Jesus possessed the kingdom, and gave the kingdom to his apostles when he left. When did he leave? Why, after his resurrection; and he gave them the kingdom of God when he left. We have got him this side of the death of Christ when he says he gave the apostles the kingdom. Then this certainly was not in the days of John, because John was dead before the Saviour was crucified. I wish you to recollect this.

"And he went to receive the kingdom." "Now," said he, "when he comes again is, when that will be, at the end of time." The point, let me say to you, is not when he is coming; we are not discussing that; that is not it. We are not discussing whether he is coming or whether he will come in two thousand years or fifty thousand years. That is not the question; not the question when he will come, but the question is, when did he go to receive his kingdom? That is the question; he did not have his kingdom until he went to receive it, according to the parable, and now the question is when did he go? I say, he went when he ascended to the Father, after his death and resurrection; when he ascended to the Father is when he went to receive the kingdom, and at which time he was coronated at the right hand of the Majesty on High, and made prince and saviour to grant repentance and the remission of sins. That is when he went to receive his kingdom, and he did not have it before he did go to receive it. And then, again, I wish you to notice the manner in which the gentleman made his argument. There is no argument about when he will come; that is not in the argument at all, it is not in the question. It is when he went; and did he go

before he was crucified or not? Now, in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we have it clearly presented when he went to receive his kingdom, as represented by the nobleman in the parable; after his death, burial and resurrection, he ascended to his Father and went to receive his kingdom.

But, again, he refers to Mr. Moore, and to Mr. Campbell, and all those men that he has quoted, in order to show the beginning of what? Well, the beginning of the church embraced in my proposition. And every time he reads it is the reformation or beginning of the reformation of the 19th century. And what was the design and end contemplated in that reformation? Why, to get back to apostolic christianity. To get right back where we are talking now, and we stand now precisely where the original church stood, and reaching this point is called a reformation; and Mr. Campbell, and others whom he reads, stand as the head or front of this reform, but not the head of any church. No one ever supposed that Alexander Campbell was the head of any church at all. He never speaks so himself; but he stood front and foremost in this reform movement, in calling people back to apostolic christianity, to the christianity established by the apostles and primitive disciples of Jesus Christ, their Lord.

But in regard to the kingdom: "I appoint unto you the kingdom," we said that *diatithemai* should be rendered promise; I promise to you a kingdom "as my Father has promised me." And he went to receive the kingdom that his Father promised him. And then he bestows the kingdom upon his disciples according to promise. Well, we said it meant promise. Now, we will quote from Mr. Greenfield; and what does he say with regard to this matter? He says, "to promise, to confirm by promise." Now, where is the proof that that word means that? Why, he says, Luke xxii. 23—the very passage now under examination—he refers to this very passage to sustain that definition of the word. "To promise or to confirm by promise." And

the gentleman said that Liddell and Scott did not give this as the primary meaning of the word. Now, I submit this proposition: I have Liddell and Scott in my room where I am stopping, and I did not suppose this question would really be raised to-night, but, then, I state this: that we have had the subject before former audiences, and I will have these authorities here to-morrow, and I challenge him now to contradict my statement, that when Liddell and Scott come to define the New Testament use of this word, the very first definition they give is promise, the very first when he comes to define the New Testament use of it. Now, let him deny this statement, and I pledge myself to prove it by introducing the work and reading from it—the very first definition is promise, when Liddell comes to give the New Testament use of the word.

But I have about run through with the points presented by the gentleman in his speech, except one, and that is this question of sucession. The gentleman seems to hang on to this question of succession with a great deal of tenacity. Well, I wish to make this statement, which I have made in our former discussion, that I have no doubt in my own mind but that God has always had a people in Babylon. He says so, and I believe it. But, then, those people in Babylon did not constitute the visible church, or kingdom of Christ. Did not. If the gentleman says it did, let him prove it, and then we will yield the question.

Now, I wish to call your attention to Bennedict and see what he says. He said he would begin to read where I had stopped. I read just what I wished to read, in order to show you my idea on the question, that the church did not depend upon establishing a succession, but upon doctrine, upon faith, upon their practice, including baptism, or these all together. Now, I will read from Benedict. He says: "We place no kind of reliance on this sort of testimony to establish the soundness of our faith, or the validity of our administration, but the more

I study the subject the stronger are my convictions that if all the facts—if all the facts were disclosed, a very good succession might be made out, or could be made out."

Now, that is his opinion on the subject. Well, *if* I had enough money I could buy out your rolling mill, or your town, or your country; but, then, that little word "if" is in the way. I have not got it, and I will have to do without it, I reckon. I have not got the money; the little word "if" is in the way. If I could get facts enough, why, then I could make it out; but, then, the trouble is the little "if" is there; he has not got the facts, and can not make it out. That is just what Benedict says. And I will read a little more (pages 34 and 35 Benedict's Church History), and he quotes from Robinson, one of the most prominent of the Baptist authorities who has ever lived, I presume the gentleman will admit this, and Benedict indorses the statement as quoted from Robinson. Now, what does he say with regard to the succession? Beginning p. 34, he says: "The doctrine of uninterrupted succession was the cause of these different claims" (referring to certain claims which he had noticed), but all attempts to prove such succession have proved ineffectual." He says: "Protestants, by the most substantial arguments, have blasted the doctrine of papal succession. And yet these very Protestants have undertaken to make proof of an unbroken series of persons of their own sentiments, following one another in due order from the apostles to themselves. The church of the papal succession has given the history and the names of real and imaginary men, of Christians and atheists, blasphemers and saints. The Lutheran succession runs in the papal channel until the reformation, and then, in a small stream, changes its course. The Calvinistic succession, which includes Presbyterians and all sects which originated from Geneva, is a zigzag, and it is made up of men of all principles and all communities; and it is very surprising that it should be made up of Popes,

Arians, and Anabaptists (one of the links in my friends chain here), exactly such men as Calvin in his zeal committed to the flames for heresy. The doctrine—now mark you—the doctrine of uninterrupted succession is necessary only to such churches as regulate their faith and practices by tradition; and for their use it was first invented. An uninterrupted succession is necessary for none but those who regulate their faith and practices by tradition. Those who regulate their faith and practices by the Word of God do not need it; it is not necessary."

Then we have Robinson and Bennedict, both testifying upon this question, and we could quote the Religious Encyclopedia, a Baptist work, which we will introduce to-morrow, where the writer takes stronger ground, if possible, than what we have read, and states that for centuries it is utterly impossible to make out a succession; that there is no difficulty in tracing the history of the anti-Christ, but the history of the church for a long time is in the dark, unknown—there is no history. But, then, I find an argument— [TIME EXPIRED.]

SECOND REPLY OF ELDER RAY.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED CONGREGATION: My worthy friend seems a little excited over the subject. I refer to his first remark in regard to Luke i. 33, *that the kingdom shall have no end;* and yet he says the kingdom was *overcome!* God's Word does not so state anywhere. Individual saints were overcome, but I call upon him to give to this people the chapter and verse that affirms that God's kingdom was *overcome*, or prevailed against. I venture the assertion that he will never find the passage. It is not there; and if he were to get such a proof-text he would get a contradiction in God's Word, which he must not attempt to do. When God avers that the child of God has *eternal life, and shall never perish*, he does not mean that eternal life will have an end, that he will become a child of satan and then become a child of eternal life after centuries have elapsed in the future. I take the Word of God to mean what it says, *that the kingdom of God shall have no end.*

But "I had almost admitted his position," he says, because I had admitted that the house of God was his church, as quoted in Timothy; and yet I was contending that the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah were not yet fulfilled. I still say those prophecies remain unfulfilled; and yet the kingdom or house of God has been established. He misapprehended the scope of my argument. These prophecies point to the triumph of the church above the nations of the earth, and all the kingdoms or nations shall flow unto it. Now, I will read again from Micah iv. 1–3: "But in the last days it shall come to pass,

that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it." This certainly has not taken place to the present time. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Have the *many nations* come up to the mountain of the house of the Lord as yet? Has that kingdom or house of the Lord been exalted above the governments of the world, and above the kingdoms? No. "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nations shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The sword shall be changed for the plowshare, and the spear to the pruning hook; and then will the kingdom be exalted; not set up in its commencement, but the same kingdom that has now an existence, set up by the Son of God during his personal ministry, will be exalted to the dominion of the world. This is the position I take. I hope that my worthy friend will understand it. But Mat. xvi. 18: "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He brings in the grammar, and says that it may mean this or may mean that. The context must certainly determine what it must be—to what antecedent it refers; and it does seem to me that it is out of all propriety for one to build a house upon a solid rock, and then affirm that the storms of years shall not prevail against the *rock* down there under the ground. I respect, dear friends, the intelligence of this people.

He quoted me as affirming about John's preaching the gospel. Well, John did preach it. But I did not refer to it in my speech. I referred to preaching of the gospel by the

Son of God himself; "That it began from Galilee, after the baptism, which John preached," was the language of the text. I referred to Heb. ii. 3, to the fact that this "great salvation first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." But, if he wishes it, I can give him a passage of Scripture showing that even John preached the gospel; and I wish your attention especially to the remark of my friend, that the beginning of the prophetic preaching was that in the days of Abraham. There was where it was to begin. And, if I look behind the day of Pentecost, I must go to Abraham, I have no other beginning! Notice Mark i. 1, 2: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee." Here, then, is not the beginning of the gospel which was preached by the prophets—in prophesy. According to his own testimony, this is not the beginning of the prophetic preaching; but the "beginning" of that gospel which is now "fulfilled in your ears." It was not fully preached by John in every respect as it was by Christ, because John's preaching was only the introduction of that gospel. *It was the beginning of the gospel.* Why did the Dr. fail to notice the passage in Luke iv: where the Saviour read the prophetic gospel, where he was to preach the acceptable year of the Lord; when he sat down and all eyes were fastened on him, he says: "*This day*"—that was before the day of Pentecost—"*is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.*" The prophetic preaching is now fulfilled, and it takes its place at this appointed time.

My friend has given an interpretation which contradicts the Saviour. He says the gospel was first preached on the day of Pentecost. He certainly has mistaken the question. I want your attention to a passage or two more on this subject, Mark i. 14: "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the

kingdom of God is at hand! repent ye, and believe the gospel." Jesus came preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. My friend says there was no gospel preached till Pentecost. Just a question of difference between him and Jesus—a difference of opinion! But, he says "at hand." He knows that the original word is in the perfect tense—*anggiken—has approached, has come.*

But, then again it is said, Luke xx. 1: "Jesus taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel." This was before the day of Pentecost. *He taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel.* The gentleman must not contradict the testimony of Jesus on these points.

In regard to the kingdom existing or being set up before the day of Pentecost, I wish to call your attention to Luke xvi. 16: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." I ask this congregation, how can men *press into the kingdom of God* before that kingdom is set up, before its existence? Notice it: "*The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.*" My friend would have you believe that the law and the prophets were until Pentecost, and that the kingdom of God was established on the day of Pentecost! This is another difference between him and his Master—his doctrine, I mean. His doctrine forces him to contradict the Son of the living God.

Mat. xi. 12: "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." How could the kingdom suffer violence when there was no kingdom "*from the days of John the Baptist until now*?" The Saviour called the twelve disciples before John was executed, and the beginning of the organization commenced with the twelve disciples.

In regard to the foundation, the prophets and apostles were

before the day of Pentecost. In Galilee, before the day of Pentecost, the organization began. And on the day of Pentecost they were added unto them the one hundred and twenty, composing the local organization. And it is evident they had transacted church business before the day of Pentecost, which was recognized by heaven. They had elected Mathias in the place of Judas who had vacated his office, and that was before the day of Pentecost. But if the Pentecostal church was only set up that day, then we have one hundred and twenty without Christian baptism. According to the gentleman's own doctrine, being without Christian baptism they were not pardoned, and then they were there without salvation! Another difficulty that the gentleman is in up to his ears. [Laughter.]

And then, how can the Dr. apply this in Mat. xxiii., where the Saviour, speaking to the Pharisees, says: "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men." They would not go in themselves, neither would they suffer those who were entering to go in. How could they *shut* something *up* that did not exist? And how could they keep people out of something that had no existence? I reckon he had better just concede that point, and conclude that Jesus and the apostles are right. Talk about getting me nearer to his position! I do not want to vary from the Word of the living God.

Well, in regard to the *least in the kingdom of heaven.* Again, for the life of me I can not see what connection that has with the proposition. Whether John was *in* or *out*, it matters not, because the Saviour called the twelve after John was in prison, and the calling of the twelve was the commencement of the organization. There is no doubt about that; and, consequently, while my friend might talk about the least in the kingdom, as a matter of criticism, it has no sort of bearing upon the setting up of the kingdom—none whatever. But I find in Mark, I believe the iv. 31, that the word *mikroteros* is ren-

dered *less* instead of *least* of all seeds. "It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds in the earth." But the Dr. said that rendering would not do; but we pass.

But, Jesus, on the day of Pentecost, was *made a prince and Saviour!* Well, brethren, it does seem to me that he is driving into Arianism, or some other *ism* that denies the divinity of Jesus. He says that on the day of Pentecost Jesus *was made Christ.* Was he not Christ before that? Was he not a Saviour before this? He was declared publicly to be a Saviour, and in that sense *made* known as a Saviour. Certainly the gentleman ought to understand this passage, where it says, "made a prince and Saviour." And then, again, where it is said he was exalted *to be* a prince and Saviour, "to be" is an interpolation—*exalted a prince and Saviour.* And when he rode lowly into Jerusalem upon a colt, it was said of him: "Behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt"; showing that when he made that triumphal entrance into Jerusalem he was then the King of Zion. And he had regal authority when he said "All power in heaven and in earth is given unto me; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." If Jesus held all power in heaven above, and all power in the earth beneath, did not he have regal authority? Talk about his being coronated on the day of Pentecost! You never learned that from God's Word. You will find that in Alexander Campbell's writings, if you examine them carefully; I want you to quit talking that kind of thing. I tell you you can not find it in the Bible.

But those great names from whom I have read quotations, they were not the head of the church, his own church, oh, no! but simply kind of heads—the head of the reformation, or leaders in it. I want to call your attention to a few other passages in regard to the rise and progress of the gentleman's church.

They are declared to be the head of the religious movement, out of which has come the church called by themselves "The Christian Church." He will not affirm that the church with which he stands identified originated at Jerusalem. It must have originated then, recently, because it is so affirmed in the passages I have quoted. In the introduction to the "Living Pulpit" we have the following, on p. 28: "We have now noticed two periods in the history of the Disciples—namely, the *Period of Formation*, and the *Period of Organization and Development*"—*the period of its formation*, and then of its *organization and development!* But was his *formation* here in the present century? Yes; according to the testimony of this writer, as he gives it on p. 31: "The Disciples are just now passing through a transition state, and it will be interesting in after years, to look over the great speeches of some of the representative men of this period." They are passing through the *transition*—not fully organized—being formed.

The statement from Mr. Benedict, that it was not necessary to establish the succession in order to defend our *claims*, I indorse his statement that it is not necessary. But, Benedict did not deny the existence of that succession—that perpetuity. That succession of the church must exist, or it is not the original church of Christ. And his statement from Mr. Robinson, does not help the matter. Robinson was talking about the *papal succession*, and those who were trying to trace succession through the Papists, according to the quotation he read from Mr. Benedict. So it does not aid him one whit in this matter.

I will call your attention, now, to some further proofs in regard to the *headship* of the gentleman's church. I had just read, when my time expired, that Mr. Campbell was recognized as the *guide* of the religious movement, out of which their church has emanated. (Memoirs by Mr. Richardson, vol. 1, p. 510:) "While Mr. Campbell was fearless, and self-

reliant and firm, Mr. Scott was naturally timid, diffident and yielding; and while the former was calm, steady and prudent, the latter was excitable, variable and precipitate. The one like the north star, was ever in position, unaffected by terrestrial influences; the other, like the magnetic needle, was often disturbed and trembling on its center, yet ever returning, or seeking to return to its true direction." This is the testimony of this eminent historian, Prof. Richardson, the author of two large volumes. He says, in regard to Alexander Campbell, that he considers him the north star of the church—of the *reformation*, unaffected by terrestrial things. But his Disciples, though trembling like the needle, point to their *polar star, Mr. Campbell.*

Brethren, the church of the living God looks to the bright Morning Star of our salvation, and that is Jesus Christ.

But, then (Memoirs, vol. 2, p. 295), "Mr. Campbell found himself to be the center of a constantly widening circle of influence, and, under divine providence, an acknowledged guide, to a large and intelligent community, zealously engaged in the work of reformation." Mr. Campbell was the *acknowledged guide* of the reformation of the nineteenth century; and they claim that their church came out of the reformation; so he was their guide in this primary movement and organization.

And, then again (Memoirs, vol. 2, p. 668), Mr. Richardson says: "Like a balance wheel, he regulated the entire movement of the reformation, and, on repeated occasions, preserved it from the disasters which were impending from the ambitions, or the rashness of its friends."

Like a great balance wheel of some vast machinery, Mr. Campbell was the *regulator* of the whole religious movement of the reformation of the nineteenth century; and the gentleman belongs to the church that commenced in the nineteenth century.

Mr. Campbell, in the year 1847, made a tour to Europe, and, on going, he received a letter of recommendation from Henry Clay, the well-known statesman of my native State. In that recommendation we have the following language (vol. 2, p. 548 of the Memoirs): "Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States."

Head and *founder* of that church! But, perhaps you will say that Mr. Campbell did not view himself such; that Mr. Campbell did not consider himself entitled to Mr. Clay's high recommendation. Do you believe that Mr. Campbell would have borne in his pocket a falsehood to recommend himself to the people of another country? No; Mr. Campbell recognized himself as the *founder* and *head* of that community. Then that church does not have Jesus Christ as its founder, or as its head.

In Hitchcock's Analysis there is appended an account of the rise of denominations, and, under the head "Disciples of Christ, commonly called Campbellites, from Alexander Campbell, founder of the sect," we find that Alexander Campbell is designated the founder of the sect, "who seceded from the session branch of the Presbyterian Church in Western Pennsylvania, in 1812." [TIME EXPIRED.]

Second Evening.

THIRD ADDRESS OF DR. LUCAS.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appear before you again in the discussion of the proposition read in your hearing last evening, and which I will again read: "The church to which I, J. R. Lucas, belong, recognized by my brethren as the Christian Church, possesses all the characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom, of Jesus Christ." This proposition I am before you again to affirm, and labor to prove. But before I advance with my argument in favor of the proposition before you, I wish to make a brief reference to the last speech of my friend. Those who were present on the last evening are aware of the fact that he indulged very liberally in quotations from Alexander Campbell and Mr. Lard, and others, and to which I do not object at all, if he feels disposed to spend his time in that way; still, I fail to see the relevancy of his quotations, and would state, as I have stated before, that Mr. Campbell and Mr. Lard, while we esteem them as good men, and many things that they teach we cordially indorse, yet they teach some things that we as cordially deny; and, consequently, they are not to settle questions such as we have before us under discussion to-night. The Word of God must settle all these questions, or they never will be settled.

The gentleman spoke of my being excited; at this, I confess,

I was somewhat amused. No doubt the audience was equally amused, or at least surprised, at the gentleman's reference. "The child of God has eternal life, and shall not perish." Well, this is true, so we say. But how does this affect the question before us? While this is true, yet it is also true that the children of God may be persecuted to that extent that their lives may be destroyed, and they taken from the earth down to the dark empire of death. They do not perish in the sense of the passage, and yet they may be destroyed, so far as this world is concerned. They may be prevailed against—they may be overcome by the powers of this world. And when this is true, it would be very difficult, I presume, for the gentleman to find his visible church or kingdom in the world. However, I want to say in regard to this matter, that so far as Mat. xvi. 18, is concerned, the point in the passage upon which my argument is made, it makes but very little difference so far as the present argument is concerned, whether the antecedent of the pronoun is "church" or "rock." But the point upon which my argument is based is this: "Upon this rock *will* I build my church." *Will* I build my church. And we purpose showing from this passage that the church is yet future, that it was not at the time this language was spoken, established; and this is the prominent point in the passage, upon which our argument is made to rest. And we state that this word here is used correctly, that this word may be used in the present tense or in the past tense every one will concede at once, but in this passage it is used in the future tense, and consequently it looks to the future for the consummation of that to which it refers; and so with regard to the use of the verb throughout its entire connection. "Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I *will* give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be

loosed in heaven." The future tense of the verb is observed throughout the entire connection.

But I call your attention again to Isaiah and Micah. You recollect my friend's remarks upon the subject. And these prophets say that in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established upon the top of the mountains, and that when this is the case the law shall go forth of Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And Joel, speaking of the same event, or referring to the same place and time when these prophesies are to be completed and fulfilled, speaks of the last days as Isaiah and Micah, and Peter, commenting upon this prophesy, says: *This* is *that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel that in the *last days* it shall come to pass, and so on.

MR. RAY—What chapter and verse in Joel, please?

MR. LUCAS—Which?

MR. RAY—What chapter and verse in Joel, please?

MR. LUCAS—Well, I am quoting from the second of Acts, the comments of Peter upon Joel's prophesy.

"But the nations shall learn war no more."

The final object of the kingdom of Jesus Christ is to overcome war, and everything of this nature and character. The kingdom of Jesus is a spiritual kingdom, and, from its commencement to the present time, it has impressed the mind with this thought, that in the kingdom of Jesus, the Christ, the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, while the kingdoms of this world use weapons and instrumentalities in their warfares of a very different nature and character. But, I notice my friend's play on the term gospel. Now, every one who has ever examined this term knows that the term gospel primarily signifies good news, and whatever is regarded as good news is gospel, for this is the meaning of the word. But, the point I present, and the issue to which I invite my friend is this: That the gospel in fact never was preached until the

first Pentecost, after the ascension of Jesus Christ; and, in proof of this statement, we call your attention to the language of Paul in 1st Cor. xv. 1-3, where he says: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." Now, Paul calls this the gospel that they had received, and by which they were saved, if they retained in their minds what he had preached unto them. Then this gospel, in fact, embracing the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus the Christ, never was preached to the people by the apostles until the first Pentecost. And so we stated there is an issue here to which we invite the gentleman, and we call upon him to show where this gospel was ever preached in fact before the time that we have stated. And this is the gospel that the apostles were commanded to preach as the embassadors of Jesus the Christ, in the kingdom of Jesus, after he had gone to receive his kingdom, and had received it. They were to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high—until the Holy Spirit came that was to guide them into all truth, and to bring to their remembrance whatsoever the Lord commanded them. But the kingdom of heaven is at hand. My friend stated that because the term *enggidzo*, as found in the third chapter of Matthew, and in other passages to which we referred, is in the perfect tense, therefore it should be rendered "the kingdom has come." Now, we say this is not the rendering of the word—this is not the correct rendering, though there is no difference between my friend and myself, with regard to the tense in which the word is found. It is in the perfect tense, we all agree to this, but to be correctly rendered, it should be "the kingdom has come near." I want to give you a little authority in regard to the meaning of the word *enggidzo*, and I want to read you a few lexicons on the subject. I wish to call your atten-

tion first to Robinson's Lexicon: *Enggidzo*, to bring near; to cause to approach; to draw near; to approach; to have drawn near; to be at hand." Thus he defines the word *enggidzo*. This is Robinson. Greenfield defines it precisely in the same way. Liddell and Scott define it precisely in the same way. Donegan defines it precisely in the same way; and if the gentleman has a lexicon that I have not, and if he will hand it to me, I will show him that his lexicon defines it the same way, for this is the way the word is defined, and not as he has defined it at all. And now we want to give you a few passages to show you the manner in which this word is used in the Scriptures, and we shall invite your attention first to Luke xix. 29: "And it came to pass, when he was come nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount called the mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples;" he sent them into the city. Now, this place where the Saviour was, is three miles from the city of Jerusalem; "and when *he had come nigh*," here we have the same word precisely, that we have in the third chapter of Matthew, where it is said that John preached, saying "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And in every other place, where we quote this form of language from the Scriptures, inspired of God. But, now we want to call your minds to Romans xiii. 12: "The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." Now, here it is stated that "the night was far spent," not that the night was gone, not that the night had entirely passed away, but "the night was far spent, and the day was at hand." It was beginning to approach. It was drawing near. Just precisely as it did in the other passages.

But we call your attention again to Philippians ii. 13, and here we have the same word employed: "Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life, to supply your lack of service toward me."

Here, now, is Epaphroditus that "was nigh unto death," but he was not dead, and he did not die at that time. But here we have the very same word, "he was *nigh* unto death." Here, then, we discover in this passage the use made of the word in the divine Scriptures. But, we call your attention not only to the use of the word as found here, but also as found in one of the letters—1st Peter iv. 7: "But the end of all things is at hand," and yet the end has not yet come. It is not yet come. And yet Peter says the end is at hand. It, therefore, may mean a short distance of time. It may mean a short time, or, from the apostle Peter's standpoint, it may mean even hundreds of years; but I simply give you this interpretation of the use of the word in these passages, to show you that they used it not with the idea that the thing to which they referred had already come, and already is in existence.

But he calls our attention to Luke xvi. 16: "The law and the prophets were until John." The parallel passage to this is found in Mat. xi. 11-14. The thirteenth verse reads: "For all the prophets prophesied until John," and "the law and the prophets" in Luke, "were until John." Since then the kingdom is preached, the kingdom of God is preached, and all men press into it. And he asked the question: "How can it be that a man can press into a kingdom that does not already exist?" Well, I want to call your attention to the remarks of Dr. Barnes, upon this same subject, and which, here, we heartily indorse. The first comment upon the passage is found in Matthew. He says: "There was a great rush or a crowd pressing to hear John; and again there is allusion had to the manner in which cities were taken and besiegers pressed upon them with violence and demolished the walls with such earnestness and violence. He said men had pressed around him, as soon as he began to preach." This is the comment, or a portion of the comment of Dr. Barnes upon these passages,

and now, in connection with these remarks, as we fully indorse what we have read here, and adopt the language as our own, we want to call your attention to a statement or two made by my friend. The gentleman last night stated that the apostles were not called until after John was executed—that they were not called until after John was executed, and they did not receive the kingdom until Jesus went away. Well, Jesus went away forty days after his resurrection—went to receive his kingdom, forty days after his resurrection. They did not receive the kingdom until he went away, the disciples, or the apostles, that my friend stated constituted the first members of the church, or kingdom, were not called until after John was executed. Now, then, these things being true, pray, tell me, how the kingdom could have been preached by John as visibly existing, as existing then, and men visibly and literally pressing into it. How could this be? These two positions can not possibly be reconciled with each other. They can not possibly both be true. But the question might arise, how then did John preach the gospel? "The law and the prophets were until John. Since then the kingdom of God is preached." How was it preached? How did John preach it? John tells us himself "the kingdom is at hand;" the kingdom is preached in this manner. John and the apostles, and the seventy, and Jesus, before the death of the Saviour, preached the kingdom. And now, in connection with these passages, I wish to submit the following rule. I now state that if the gentleman will show that we are wrong in regard to the rule we submit, by which these passages and others should be interpreted; if he will show the fallacy of this rule, we pledge you that we will surrender the question; and the rule is this: "Things that are future, are very frequently spoken of as being present or past, while things present, or past, are never spoken of as future." Now, then, if the gentleman will show the fallacy of this rule of interpretation, we pledge you that, so

far as these passages are concerned, we will surrender the point, and must find some other solution of the question presented

But succession again. Well, it is not necessary to spend more time upon this subject, for the gentleman has already admitted that it is not necessary in order to identify the church of God, that a connected chain of succession be made out. He says he indorses what Benedict says upon the subject, and though he says the succession must exist, yet it is not necessary that it be made out, or that we be able to make it out, and consequently we leave this matter for the present with you.

But Clay's letter to Mr. Campbell, to show that Mr. Campbell is the head of the church. Now, then, I deny that Campbell ever asked Mr. Clay for a letter; I deny that Campbell ever showed that letter to anybody; it was simply an expression from Mr. Clay of the partiality and friendship he had for Mr. Campbell, he having learned that he was about starting on a tour to Europe, and he having acted as presiding Moderator in that debate conducted between Campbell and Rice, from his personal friendship; it was but a friendly expression of his own feeling on the subject. And I deny that Mr. Campbell ever exhibited it to any one; and though we were to grant and make the case as strong as possible, that even Mr. Campbell himself claimed to be the head of the church, I will ask the gentleman to show where the Christian Church as a church, as a body, ever have recognized any such claim on the part of Alexander Campbell, or on the part of any mortal man upon the footstool of God? There is no such thing, even if it were claimed, has never been countenanced or indorsed for a single moment; but the thing itself is fallacious, and we, claim, has never been made.

But now we advance with our argument. The second argument that we submitted was, that we were in perfect accordance with primitive teaching with regard to the foundation.

In the twenty-eighth chapter of the prophesy of Isaiah, it is there: "The foundation, the precious corner-stone, the tried stone," having reference to Jesus Christ. And as presented in Mat. xvi. 18, the same foundation is again referred to by the Saviour: "Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and 1st Cor. iii. 11: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And in Eph. ii. 19, 20, we have these words: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone*." Jesus, then, is the foundation. Thus he was presented primitively; and thus we affirm there is no other foundation of the church than Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. He is the true foundation. And here, again, we say we are identical in teaching and in faith with the primitive church; and if they were right upon this question we must be right, because we occupy precisely the same ground. And, third, we remark that we have the one only infallible creed, the Word of God, that and nothing else—the Word of God to the exclusion of all other creeds, to the exclusion of all other confessions of faith or of discipline. We take the Word of God and say in the language of 2d Tim. iii. 16: "The Scriptures inspired of God are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The Scriptures then furnish the doctrine, they furnish the reproof, they furnish the correction, they furnish the instruction in righteousness, so that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works. We say, then, that here we are in accordance with the practice of the primitive church. They recognize no other authority than that of the Word of God, the teaching of inspiration to control and govern their faith, and to regulate and direct their practices in life.

But we remark, fourth, that we recognize the one scriptural head, even Jesus the Christ—he is the head of all things to the church. So Paul affirms in his letter to the Galatians i. 18. He is the one head of the body, the church; we acknowledge no other head; we say that Jesus is the head, and he only is the head of the one body, and the one church established by him under his authority, and established and presented to the world. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Second Evening.

ELDER RAY'S THIRD REPLY.

Mr. President and Brethren Moderators: I enter at once, after a few questions, upon the reply. First, I ask Dr. Lucas, as he denies the perpetuity of the church, to tell me from history, sacred or profane, when did the church, or kingdom, of Jesus Christ become extinct? Second, when did it have a second beginning? Third, how many times has it become extinct since it was first organized?

Of my quotations, from their authors, he says: "We deny many things that they teach;" intimating that I was not within the bounds of my legitimate work in quoting from the standard authors of his own church. He has already admitted, in a former discussion, that Mr. Campbell is of greater authority in his church than himself. He has already admitted that these are able men.

He has affirmed that the church organization with which he himself stands identified is the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. He might hold the correct theory then of the commencement and have no connection with any church, and if the fact that the gentleman holds the correct theory, makes his the kingdom, then it might be proved that himself is the kingdom—the whole of it! He must not simply prove similarity, or that they have a certain theory. He must come down to the question, and prove identity—that this present

organization with which I, J. R. Lucas, stand identified, is the kingdom of God. That is the question before us, and, in order to show the characteristics of his church, I am bound to quote from his standard authors. I can not do otherwise. It is a matter of necessity. I am compelled to do it.

But he can not understand my statement about the children of God having everlasting life. I affirmed that when God said that those who believed in him, possessed *eternal life*, it meant life without end, and when He said that the kingdom was an *everlasting* kingdom, that the kingdom was to have no end; and if the kingdom had come to an end, eternal life might come to an end. He misapprehended my argument.

But, Mat. xvi. 18, again, in regard to the setting up of the kingdom: "Upon this rock will I build my church." I think I have said enough upon this subject, showing from the lexicons, that that word is used in the sense of *up-build*, or increase more and more from the foundation. But I pass that.

The last days. He intimated that the prophet Isaiah and the prophet Micah must have had reference to the day of Pentecost, because they said: "In the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains;" and he affirmed that Joel had reference to the same event, and that Peter quoted from Joel, affirming that that prophesy was fulfilled upon the day of Pentecost. I deny that Peter had reference to Micah, or to Isaiah; he referred to Joel, and Joel does not utter the same prediction at all. That is why I asked him to tell me where Joel made any such statement. Now, in regard to the *last days*, he can not count that prophesy there *one* day. It is plural—*days*, or *last days*, included the last dispensation from the commencement of the Christian dispensation, until Christ shall come the second time.

But, I call your attention upon this subject to Heb. i. 1, 2: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in

time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;" showing that those days down in the time of Paul, were included in the "last days." It is not confined then to Pentecost. Then, again, we have the testimony of Paul to Timothy: "But with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb, without blemish, and without spot; Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you." It is 1st Peter i. 19, 20, I should have stated, showing that these *last times* include the time of Peter's letter.

Your attention is again called to 1st Cor. xv: "Paul preached the gospel." My friend said that that gospel required the death and the resurrection of Christ; that the gospel could not have been preached before that time. I ask him, how were men saved before that time? As he affirmed that the Saviour was not the Christ! for, according to my friend, he was made Christ and Lord upon the day of Pentecost; that he was not coronated till then; that he was not King till then! I ask him, how were men saved before the day of Pentecost? Were they not saved in Christ? and, as I have already read, was he not "as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

In regard to the prophetic preaching, he did not answer the question last night. The first beginning of prophetic preaching, he said, was back in the days of Abraham. I showed to him that the preaching of John was the *beginning* of the gospel, the introduction; and that the Son of God preached it in its fullness. And in Luke, fourth chapter, he said: "This day" —quoting from Isaiah—"this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Now, his interpretation would have it fulfilled on the day of Pentecost!

In regard to that word that he admits is in the perfect tense, *anggike*—at hand—I have a statement from Olshau-

sen, his comment upon it, thus: "The perfect *ēggike* is to be taken in the present sense; so that the meaning is, the kingdom of God is already present." And, again, "In the *latter* relation the kingdom of God appears according to the New Testament conception, as actually present, not merely in the person of the Saviour himself, but also in his believing followers, who were translated into the spirit of his life." This shows that this eminent commentator takes this same position that the kingdom was actually present, and men were in it. But, Luke xvi. 16—my friend thinks that they *rushed toward John*, where it is said, "that from the days of John the Baptist until now that men pressed into the kingdom of God," or, rather, as the quotation is, "the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it;" but he has them pressing around John, for pressing into the kingdom! Then you will have John in the kingdom according to Barnes, the authority quoted. Upon this subject the eminent critic and commentator, Alford, says: "The actual existence of the kingdom of heaven as a present and powerful fact." (In Lange, p. 253) So he contended that the kingdom was in existence as a present and powerful fact at that time. This is the testimony of one of the finest scholars and critics known in the world.

I was sorry he made a mistake in saying that I said that Jesus did not call the apostles until after John was dead. The report will show *that* as a palpable mistake, and I call for the report.

Mr. Lucas—I call for the report.

Mr. Ray—Shall we wait till it is read?

Mr. Lucas—Settle it now.

Mr. Ray—I was going to state what I stated first; that will be in point, and perhaps that will satisfy you when I make my statement, *that the apostles were not called until John was in pris-*

on. Some suppose that he was in prison a year and a half before he was executed. I state on my own veracity and my recollection and knowledge of the facts, that—

MR. LUCAS—As far as the argument is concerned, I will accept that statement.

MR. RAY—If you call for the report, we will have it read—

MR. LUCAS—As far as the argument is concerned, I will accept that statement.

MR. RAY—Very well. John did not set up the kingdom. He came to prepare the materials made ready for the work. And as to its organization into a church, this was done by the Son of God himself. The twelve apostles were the first members as an organic body. This has already been presented, and I do not think he has answered it. We referred to that symbolical city that represents the bride, the lamb's wife, the church which had *twelve* foundations, and in them the names of the *twelve apostles* of the Lamb. And the kingdom in its origin was like a grain of mustard seed, said the Saviour. It could not be like a grain of mustard seed on the day of Pentecost. But he gave us a rule to this effect, *that things in the future are often spoken of as present or past, but things present are never spoken of as future.* This, I believe, is a fair statement of the rule.

MR. LUCAS—Well, that is not all of it.

MR. RAY—That things *present* are spoken of as *future,* I wish to read a statement from Crosby's Greek Grammar in regard to tenses. He says:

"The relations of time have nothing sensible to fix the conception of the mind. It ranges therefore with freedom through all time, the past, the present, and the future; and, without difficulty, conceives of the *past* or *future* as present, and even of the *present* or *future* as already past. That the Greek language should have a peculiar freedom in the interchange of tenses is but the natural consequence of the wonderful vivacity of the Greek mind." (P. 359.) On the same page he says:

"The pres., in its widest generic sense, includes *all the other tenses* (see B.); as a definite tense used archronically (§ 565), it includes the impf. in its widest generic sense, includes *all the past tenses* (§173); and the Aor., *all the definite and complete tenses.*" Thus it appears that the future is sometimes spoken of as present, and that the *present* is sometimes spoken of as future. And he said that if this rule was overthrown he would give up the contest in regard to the setting up of the kingdom. Well, his rule is gone, according to one of the best Greek grammarians.

Again, in regard to the Clay letter. I understood him to deny that whole matter in regard to the Clay letter. I give you the statement of Mr. Richardson—Memoirs of Mr. Campbell, vol. 2, p. 548: "Having received highly commendatory letters of introduction from Henry Clay," and then in a foot note he says: "The following is Mr. Clay's letter, which he kindly forwarded to Mr. Campbell when he learned that he was going abroad. Like many others he was under the impression that Mr. Campbell was a doctor of divinity, and misconceived his true position in other respects." And this quotation is a part of that letter:

"Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States;" showing that the publication of that letter was an indorsement of the fact contained in it, that Mr. Campbell was the *founder* and *head* of the gentleman's church; and Mr. Clay was not so ignorant of the position occupied by Mr. Campbell, as not to know what position he occupied.

But, I call your attention to another historic statement, from Mr. Charles V. Segar (Life of A. Campbell, p. 25): "Alexander Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the recognized head of a new religious movement, the pur-

pose of which was to restore primitive Christianity in all its simplicity and beauty. Out of this movement has grown a people, who choose to call themselves Christians, or Disciples, now numbering not less than five hundred thousand members in the United States."

Alexander Campbell became the *recognized* HEAD of this *new religious movement*, the purpose of which was to restore primitive Christianity—showing that he began from nothing to restore the church; and yet my friend repudiates the headship of the founder of his church.

But, he tells us that they have the right foundation—that they have built upon the Lord Jesus Christ. I have never read a writer in all that denomination yet, that simply stated that Jesus Christ, without some qualifying term, was the foundation of the church. Nearly all of them say it was Peter's confession, or Peter's proposition, or Peter's statement of a truth; but the Dr. is being educated a little toward the truth; and I am glad of it, for he says now, that it is the Lord Jesus Christ. This will do, but it is not the view taken generally by writers in his denomination.

I would like to have your attention to a statement I have in regard to the foundation (page 58 of Millenial Harbinger, vol. 1), Mr. Campbell says: "But we will attempt to show that there will be, or that there is now, a scheme of things presented in what is called the Ancient Gospel, long enough, broad enough, strong enough for the whole superstructure called the Millenial Church—and that it will alone be the *instrument* of *converting* the whole human race, and of uniting all Christians upon one and the same foundation." Here, then, Mr. Campbell presents *his scheme of things*, which he calls "the ancient gospel" as the FOUNDATION for the church. The gentleman is mistaken, then, in regard to their taking Jesus Christ alone as their founder and head.

Now, I wish to ask another question or two. *Can any one be*

saved—a Christian—outside of the kingdom of Christ, out of the church? I hope he will not forget this question. But, again, in regard to the setting up of the church: *Were the original one hundred and twenty disciples, including the twelve, introduced into the Christian Church without Christian baptism?* The gentleman contends that the Christian baptism was first administered on the day of Pentecost. The one hundred and twenty original members were there, and were not baptized. He rejects the baptism administered by John, and by Christ, from the Christian dispensation, and, if Christian baptism is essential to membership in the Christian Church, then he has one hundred and twenty members without that membership!

But I wish to advance in my line of argument in the negative, and to call your attention to the fact that I was proving that Mr. Campbell is recognized as the founder and head of the gentleman's church. Again, Mr. Richardson, their historian (vol. 2, p. 398), says: "From the more elevated region of religious thought which Mr. Campbell occupied, he could well look down with pity upon all the vain attempts which were at this time made to arrest the progress of his plea for the restoration of the primitive gospel, the original unity of the church."

This gentleman says, then, that Mr. Campbell, elevated to his position as a reformer, and recognized as the head of the new religious movement, could now "look down with pity upon the vain attempts which were made to arrest the progress of his plea for reformation." Again (vol. 1, p. 257), Mr. Richardson says: "Here was an effort, not so much for the reformation of the church as was that of Luther and Calvin, and to a certain extent even that of the Haldanes, but for its complete *restoration* at once to its primitive purity and perfection." He was not aiming to *reform* the church, according to this statement, but to *restore* or *set up* a church, and if he *reformed* the church, where was the church before he re-

formed it?—what church did he reform? What was it called before he *reformed* it? I hope the gentleman will note these.

Again, vol. 2, p. 38 of the Memoirs, he proceeds: "The process of demolition was not with him an ultimate end, for if he sought to remove the awkward and ricketty structures of partyism, or the broken and accumulated rubbish of human tradition, it was that he might build again upon their ancient sites the bulwarks and towers of Zion." Here it is acknowledged that Alexander Campbell was attempting to destroy and erect systems of religion. He did not propose to stop when he had pulled down the existing kingdoms, but his work was *to build again upon their ruins the bulwarks of Zion!* Here, then, is the claim that Alexander Campbell was a *builder* of *their* Zion; and there is no escape from it, unless you prove that Mr. Richardson, one of the ablest men the Disciples ever had in their denomination, did not understand what he was talking about. Again, Mr. Richardson affirms that the purpose of Mr. Campbell was a *restoration* rather than a reformation (vol. 2, p. 254). And in Fleetwood's Life of Christ, in the appendix, there is a statement in regard to the rise of the denomination of "Campbellite Baptists or Disciples:" "This denomination is sometimes known by the name of Christians. It was founded by the Rev. Alexander Campbell about the year 1827." And I have testimony upon testimony upon this subject, that Mr. Campbell even claimed to be the harbinger and was preparing the way for the second coming of Christ. He makes a statement here [Memoirs, vol. 2, p. 252] to this effect: "We have to dispossess demons, and exorcise unclean spirits, as well as to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. The chief priests, scribes and rulers of the people are generally in league against us;" showing that he compared his work to that of the Son of God himself. This church is not the church of the living God, because it has Alexander Campbell for its *founder and head.* My *fourth negative argument is this:* "The

Disciples are not the church of Christ, because they are not built upon the Bible foundation. I have shown you that they build upon Mr. Campbell's interpretation of the Bible. They do not administer the same plan of salvation, that salvation bestowed by the Son of God himself while he was upon the earth, who said to that poor penitent woman: "Thy sins are forgiven. Thy *faith* hath saved thee. Go in peace." [TIME EXPIRED.]

FOURTH ADDRESS OF DR. LUCAS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I wish to notice a few points in my friend's last speech, and then I shall advance with my line of argument in favor of my proposition. And, first, I will consider for a moment the gentleman's reference to the "last days." I simply repeat, that I am willing to leave that matter with you. Peter says in Acts, 2d chapter, in referring to the prophesy of Joel: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet in the last days." He says, right there: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel," that he speaks of as occurring in the last days, and I presume the apostle understood himself, and I take just what he said upon that question. But "Paul preached the gospel." Now, I have stated that the gospel was never preached in fact, and the gentleman has not denied that proposition, only in a kind of circuitous way. I stated that Paul preached the gospel in fact, but that the gospel in fact never was preached until the day of Pentecost, and that no man can preach the gospel in fact unless he preaches that Jesus has died, was buried, and has risen again; and before that time these facts never were preached in fact—they never were preached as having occurred, as having taken place. But he wants to know how people were saved before that time. I suppose that with regard to the Jews, with all those living before the death of Jesus, the gentleman and I will have no controversy. I say they were saved by looking to the one that was to come, believing on the one, or looking to the one that was to come—the one that was prom-

ised. And hence, so far as the gospel of their salvation was concerned, it was a gospel in promise, and so far as John was concerned, he preached to the people, saying or requiring that they should believe in Him that was to come after—that was to come after him. But the rule referred to by me, the gentleman seems to misconceive the point that I had in view in the presentation of the rule, I had stated before, and if I omitted it in the statement of the rule, it was simply an omission. I have stated in former discussions the rule that the Scriptures very frequently speak of things as though present or as past that were yet in the future, while they never speak of things that are past or present, or things present or past as belonging to the future. I stated that this was true with regard to the Scriptures of God, and if he can show that this rule is a fallacy, then I stated that so far as my interpretations of the passages referred to were concerned, that I would yield the point and would be compelled to give another solution of the passages. That was my statement, and I renew it now, and let him show the fallacy of the rule as presented.

But his statement with regard to John being in prison. I accept that statement so far as the present argument is concerned, and there is no change in the argument or difficulty whatever presented. That the disciples of Jesus Christ, or the apostles, were never called till after John was imprisoned, and as they formed, according to my friend's position—and we will not controvert that—that they formed the charter members of the church, so far as the present point is concerned, we now simply take that statement, but they were not called until after John was imprisoned, and if they were the charter members of the church, as a matter of course the church or kingdom was not established until those members were called. But John preached the kingdom of God is at hand before he was in prison. If he preached the kingdom of God at hand before he was in prison, and these members were not called

until after he was in prison, it stands as clear as that two and two make four that John did not preach the actual existence of the kingdom, but preached that the kingdom was drawing near. But, so far as the argument is concerned, I do not care whether he was in prison or executed, for the argument is precisely the same, and the difficulty that we presented before is the same. But, again, he says that he understood me to deny the whole affair of the Clay letter. I venture to say, nobody in this house understood me to say that, not a single soul in this house—I will venture to say—understood me to make any such statement as to deny the whole affair. I stated that Alexander Campbell never showed that letter; it cannot be proven; but that Henry Clay, from his own personal friendship toward Mr. Campbell, having presided as President Moderator in the discussion between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice, and a personal acquaintance having learned of the expected tour of Mr. Campbell to Europe, out of pure friendship he sent to Mr. Campbell the letter. That is what I said. Is that denying the whole affair? And yet he understood me to deny the whole affair! He has a singular understanding sometimes. But the authority that he quotes with reference to Mr. Campbell as the head of the reformatory movement. I have said all upon that subject that I wish to say. If my friend wishes to continue to quote these authorities, that he calls authorities, just let him quote them. But he says that I acknowledge that Mr. Campbell was greater authority than myself. I did not do any such thing. My friend is mistaken. He is simply mistaken upon that question. I stated that Mr. Campbell was a greater man than I ever claimed to be, and I say that yet. But, so far as the church is concerned, Mr. Campbell is of no more authority than anybody else —no more authority than anybody else. Neither Mr. Campbell, nor any one else, is authority with the church with which I sustain a connection, only so far as they present

the unadulterated Word, and then it is not the man that constitutes that authority, but the Word, the Word of the living God. Mr. Campbell is of no more authority in the church than I am. The Word of God—this constitutes the authority.

But we now advance in our argument, and we present you —having shown in our fourth argument that Jesus Christ was the head of the church, and that he was the only head—we now call your attention,

Fifthly—To this fact, that we possess the true scriptural name—the family name—the name given to the family by the divine authority—as we shall labor to prove. But, before we proceed with the argument, we desire to make a few statements in your hearing. The first statement to which we call your attention, in regard to the name Christian, is this: the term Christian is derived from the term Christ; the term Christ is translated from the Greek word *Christos*—which means anointed—*Christos* or Christ—the anointed. Seeing, then, that the term Christian is derived from the term Christ, which means anointed, may we not affirm that Christians are the anointed children of God? Secondly—this name is a name of distinction, intended to distinguish those who wear it from all other people. Thirdly—the name Christian is intended to point out those who bear it as the property of Christ, as belonging to Christ. Fourthly—the name Christian is a catholic name, intended to swallow up all other ecclesiastical titles. Fifthly—the name is a patronymic name. Sixthly—this name Christian was given by divine authority; and this point we expect to establish in your minds beyond a reasonable doubt.

Before making our direct appeal to the inspired Scriptures, however, we will read in your hearing some statements gathered from a few of the learned ones who have commented and who have written upon the Bible and the subjects contained therein. The first name that we shall notice in your hearing

is that of Dr. Clark. We read Dr. Clark's comment on a portion of it as found upon the 11th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and the 26th verse: "And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." This is what Dr. Clark says:

"It is evident it was the name taken from Christ, their master; as the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* had their names from their masters, *Plato* and *Pythagoras*. Now, as these had their names from those great masters, because they attended their teachings, and credited their doctrines, so the disciples were called *Christians*, because they took Christ for their teacher, crediting his doctrines, and following the *rule of life* laid down by him. It has been a question, by whom was this name given to the disciples. Some think *they* assumed it; others that the inhabitants of Antioch gave it to them, and others that it was given by Saul and Barnabas." The latter opinion is favored by the *Codex Bezæ*, which reads the 25th and 26th verses: "Thus, after hearing that Saul was at Tarsus, he departed seeking for him, who, having found him, he besought him to go to Antioch, and when they were assembled with the church a whole year, and instructed a great number, and there they first called the disciples at Antioch Christians."

The word *chrematisai*, in our common text, which we translate *were called*, signifies, in the New Testament, *to appoint, warn*, or *nominate by divine direction*. In this sense the word is used in Mat. ii. 12. If, therefore, the name was given by divine appointment, it is most likely that Saul and Barnabas were directed to give it; and that, therefore, the name Christian is from God, as well as that grace and holiness which are so essentially required and implied in the character. Before this time the Jewish converts were simply called, among themselves, disciples—that is, scholars, believers, saints, the church, or assembly—and by their enemies, Nazarenes, Galileeans, the men of this way or sect; and, perhaps,

by other names, which have not come down to us. They considered themselves as one family, and hence the appellation of brethren was frequent among them. It was the design of God to make all who believed of one heart and one soul, that they might consider him as their Father, and live and love like children of the same household."

A *Christian*, therefore, is the highest character which any human being can bear upon earth, and to receive it from God, as those appear to have done, how glorious the title.

Thus Dr. Clark speaks upon the subject of the name, and we will call your attention to his closing remarks upon this subject: "It appears that 'Christian' was the first general appellative of the followers of our blessed Lord, and there is presumptive evidence, as we have seen, that the appellative name was by divine appointment. How very few of those who profess this religion are satisfied with this title. That very church that arrogates all to itself has totally abandoned this title, and its members call themselves Roman Catholics, which is absurd, because the adjective and substantive include opposite ideas.

"Catholic signifies universal, and Roman signifies of, or belonging to Rome. If it be merely Roman, it can not be Catholic. If it be Catholic, it can not be confined to Rome. But it is not Catholic, nor universal in any sense of the word, for it contains but a small part of the people who profess Christianity. The term Protestant has more common sense in it, but not much more piety. Almost all sects and parties proceed in the same line, but Christian is a title seldom heard of, and the spirit and practices of Christians but rarely occur. When all return to the spirit of the gospel, they will, probably, resume the appellative of *Christians*."

Thus Dr. Clark closes his remarks upon this subject.

I now wish to invite your attention to the statement of Dr. Davies upon this subject. Dr. Davies was president of the

college of New Jersey, and one of the ripest scholars of his day. He was a member of the Presbyterian Church, while Dr. Clark, as you are aware, was a member of the Methodist Church. Therefore, what these men say upon the question is stated from the force of truth, and not from any religious partiality, or friendship arising from religious association. Here are the words of Mr. Davies upon the subject, found in Acts xi. 26. And this is the way he discourses upon the subject in his first volume of sermons, page 209: "The name of Christian was not the first by which the followers of Christ were distinguished. Their enemies called them Galileeans, Nazarenes, and other names of contempt, but, among themselves, they were called saints, from their holiness; disciples, from their learning their religion from Christ as their teacher; believers, from their believing in him as the Messiah, and brethren, from their mutual love and their relation to God and each other. But after some time they were distinguished by the name of Christians. This they first received at Antioch, an heathen city, a city infamous for all manner of vice and debauchery; a city that had its name from Antiochus Epiphanes, the bitterest enemy the church of the Jews ever had. A city very rich and powerful, from whence the Christian name would have an extensive circulation, but it is long since laid in ruins, and unprotected by that sacred name. In such a city was Christ pleased to confer his name upon his followers, and you can not but see that the very choice of a place discovers his wisdom, grace and justice."

The original word that is here rendered "called," seems to intimate that they were called Christians by divine appointment, for it generally signifies an oracular nomination, or declaration from God, and to this purpose it is generally translated. Hence, it follows that the very name Christian, as well as the thing, was of a divine origin—assumed not by a private agreement of the disciples, among themselves, but by

the appointment of God. And in this view it is a remarkable accomplishment of an old prophesy of Isaiah, found in Isaiah lxii. 2: "The Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the LORD shall name."

See also Isaiah lxv. 15: "The Lord * * shall call his servants by another name." We call your attention to these extracts from these men, who are not by religious association at all prejudiced in favor of the name, for their organizations do not adopt this name. They do not adopt this name, but yet the force of truth compels these men to make the statements they have made upon this subject. I have made these quotations, especially the one from Dr. Clark, for the following reasons: First, to bring before you the reasons which the Dr. had for thinking that the name Christian was given by divine authority. Secondly, to get before your minds the causes which led to the abandonment of the name as a church name, and the adoption of sectarian titles. My third object in introducing into this discussion Dr. Clark's testimony is, to show his view as to the use that will likely be made of the name Christian, when we all return to the true spirit of the gospel. From what he says, he must have believed that the time will yet come, when all true believers in Christ will return to the spirit of the gospel, and that when that time comes, all party names will be abandoned, and the followers of our Divine Lord will be simply called Christians.

It may also develop further light upon this subject to introduce the passages of Scripture referred to by Dr. Clark, in order to confirm the meaning which is attached to the Greek word *kreematizo*, as found here, Mat. ii. 12: "And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way." Also Luke ii. 26: "And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ."

Acts x. 22: "And they said, Cornelius the centurion, a just man, and one that feareth God, and of good report among all the nations of the Jews, was warned from God by an holy angel to send for thee into his house, and to hear words of thee."

In the first of these passages the name of God is not found in the original. The whole expression "warned of God" is translated from the simple word *kreematizo*. The same is true in reference to Acts x. 22. The word here is rendered "reveal" in Luke ii. 26. And the Holy Spirit is named as the agent by whom the revelation was made. But the admonition made by the Holy Spirit is of divine authority as being made by the Heavenly Father himself. These examples show very clearly that the king's translators understood this term "*kreematizo*" to signify, as Greenfield has defined it in the New Testament, to import a divine warning or admonition, giving instructions or directions under the guidance of inspiration. This word occurs nine times in the New Testament Scriptures, and is translated in the common version "warned of," or "from God," four times; "revealed," once; "call," twice; "we speak," once; and "admonish," once. In all these occurrences of the word there are but two upon which there has ever been any discussion, so far as I know. There has never been any discussion whatever, so far as my knowledge goes, upon the occurrences of the word referred to, except upon two passages, and one of these is in Acts xi. 26, and one is found in Romans vii. 3. All have agreed that the "warning" and "revealing" and "speaking" came by divine authority. As before stated, the exceptions are, Romans vii. 3. and Acts xi. 26. In Romans vii. 3: "She shall be called an adulteress," surely means more than that she shall be so styled by her enemies, or by the people. It signifies that she shall be so called by the will of God. So I think in regard to the passage Acts xi. 26. It means that the disciples were called Christians by

the divine authority which Paul and Barnabas received from God the Divine Father.

In further proof of the proposition that the name Christian is of divine origin, we will compare Amos ix. 11, 12, with Acts xv. 16, 17. The former reads thus: "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name." The latter reads thus: "And after this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

In regard to these Scriptures, I will now state that whatever is said to be done, or is to be done in fulfilment of them, is done by the Lord. For you will remember that the statement is that the Lord "doeth all these things." Further, all the apostles understood Amos ix. 12, to apply to the Christian Church. At the time the apostle James makes this quotation, the apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem were sitting in solemn council deliberating on one of the most important questions that had ever disturbed the church of God. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S FOURTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: I call your attention again to the Dr.'s rule concerning time. I understand him, and I think it will be so found in the report, that he made his rule as a criticism upon the Greek language. Mr. Crosby, in his Greek grammar, says in regard to the tenses: "The future sometimes occurs for the *present* or *past* tense, as a less distinct and positive form of expression, or as though the action were not yet finished." Thus his rule has gone by the board.

It is said that the last shall be first. I will call your attention to the testimony of Alexander Campbell upon the name *Christian*. As he was the founder and head of the religious movement out of which his church has come, he certainly had as much right to name his own house, his own church that he built, as one of his children. I believe the father of the child has the best right to name it. The Dr. comes up now to prove that the Disciples have the characteristics of the true church, because they have the right name. In the proposition he uses the phrase "Christian Church." I ask him, just now, to make a minute of this, and tell me in what chapter and verse of God's Word the term "Christian Church" is found, and where "Christian" stands in connection with "church."

By common consent, the name Christian is used by all denominations who profess the Christian faith. It is applied to individuals just as it was applied in the Bible, whether it came by the divine appointment or not. If his argument proves anything, it will prove that the Methodist Church, the Presby-

terian Church, the Catholic Church, and all the churches have the right name; because they use the name Christian much more frequently than it is used by the apostles. It was not given by them, it was given by those who opposed the cause of Christ. It was alluded to by Peter: "If any man suffer as a Christian." This shows that they were persecuted as *Christians.* But Mr. B. W. Stone, who was one of the reformers mentioned as associated with Mr. Campbell, when the church was being formed and about to receive its local habitation and name. Mr. Campbell had a name for it, and Mr. Stone wanted to name it. They had a controversy about the *name.* Mr. Stone contended for the name "Christian Church," and that it was of divine authority, and of divine appointment. Mr. Campbell pleaded and contended against him. I read from the Milennial Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 394:

"And if ever *chrematizo* signifies to name or call by divine authority, it is most certainly from accident or from circumstances, and not from the import of the term: *for it means no such thing.* The root of the word is *chrema,* business; and because it was usual to designate or name persons from their business, as Smith, Taylor, Baker, Clark, &c., so the word *chrematizo,* formed from *chrema,* came actively to signify, to name, or to call, and passively to be named or called." Mr. Campbell continues: "Our worthy friend has been too precipitate also in quoting Adam Clark on this passage. Adam Clark begins the section from which he quotes with an if—'if, therefore, the name was given by divine appointment.' He enters not decisively into the matter. That the word sometimes signifies to warn, admonish, or appoint, whether by God, angels, or men, is abundantly evident, and occurs sometimes in this acceptation in the New Testament. In this we agree with Adam Clark. But with Dr. Campbell we agree that *chrematizo* does not necessarily imply *from* God more than the word *warning* does. This is evident from the reference which, both in sacred

authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. He condemns Dr. Doddridge's version of Acts xi. 26 (see his note on Mat. ii. 12). I am bold to affirm, in the face of all criticism, that here is not the least authority *in the word here used*, for concluding that the word *Christian* came from God, any more than from Antiochus Epiphanes! This may be too strong for some who contend that the *name* Christian is of divine authority; but let them put me to the proof.

"That it was given neither by dream, oracle, angel, nor apostle, is, in my judgment, by far the more probable opinion. If it had been given by the authority of the Lord it would not have been delayed for *ten years* after the day of Pentecost, nor reserved for the city of Antioch to be the place of its origin. 'The *Disciples* were first named *Christians* in Antioch A.D. 43.'" Again, p. 395, Mr. Campbell says: "The Antiochians called the disciples first Christians; Agrippa used the term once in reference to himself; and Peter said that if any man was indited as a Christian, or 'if any man suffered as a Christian, let him not be *ashamed*;' which argues that it was under this name their enemies persecuted and traduced them. But no document has come down to us authorizing us to think that this name Christians was regarded by any of the apostles as of divine appointment. If Paul, in any of his letters—if Peter, James, or John had only once said: 'To the *Christians* in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Greece, Asia, Judæa,' or anywhere else; then, indeed, there might have been some ground to think that they regarded it as of divine appointment! And, recollect, it was fifty years and more from the time they were first called Christians, before all the New Testament was written. They were called disciples, saints, believers, the called, sanctified, in the Acts and in the Epistles; but never once addressed under the name Christians.

"Now let it be remembered, that we have no objection to the name Christian if we only deserve it; nor predilection for the

name *disciple*, except for its antiquity and modesty; but when it is plead for as of divine authority, and as the only or most fitting name which can be adopted, we must lift up our voice against the imposition, and contend for the liberty where the Lord has left us free."

Thus, according to Mr. Campbell's estimate, it is an imposition to contend that the name Christian is of divine authority and the most fitting name that can be adopted.

A reference was made by the author that the Dr. read to the *new name* (Isaiah lxii. 2) "which the mouth of the Lord shall name." We will find what the name of the church is, if he adopts that name. "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the LORD shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah, and thy land Beulah: for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married." Thus, the name of his church is Hephzi-bah, if he adopts the name of his author; and the country in which it lives must be called *Beulah*, or else it can not be the true church! Is that the name of your church? You have made a very unfortunate quotation. Now, if you will examine the subject you will find that Zion, at a certain time in the future, when the Jews shall return and the land be inhabited, and thus married—that God is going to call Zion Hephzi-bah, because he delights in her. Does it not seem strange, dear friends, that you are asked to believe that he has the true church just because he has the right name? Suppose that I had a pet, it don't matter just exactly what kind it is—it may be a goat, however, and I call that goat by a *new name*, and I call it "sheep," will anybody say "that's a sheep, because it has the right name?" I may call it by the name *sheep*, and it will

come, and you may call it by the name *sheep* and it will come; and yet it is a *goat*. It is strange to me that in this enlightened land, a denomination will come up and claim that they are the true church because they have the right name! But the name *Christian* was never given by divine authority even to individual Christians—the children of God.

I do not object to the name as we ordinarily use it; but I don't claim it is of divine authority; for, in a verse or two below, where they were first called "Christians," Luke says, "disciples;" and all afterward they speak of themselves as *disciples*, and not once is a letter addressed to "Christians," or to the "Christian Church"—not once. They are called "saints," "disciples," "believers," "children of God," and all those names.

Now, let us pass to his other arguments, although he has a great many more arguments on the name *Christian!* He affirms the negative that Mr. Campbell never showed Mr. Clay's letter of introduction to any one. How does he know it? Did he go with Mr. Campbell? He affirms that he did not show it, and that he did not ask for it. He don't even know that. He don't know, if it was sent to him.

The ancients were saved by looking to, and believing in, the Saviour to come. Thus the gospel was preached to them. And when the Saviour came and preached his own gospel, he preached his own *death and sufferings* at Jerusalem, and that he was to be *buried*, and that he was to *rise* again the third day; he preached his own death, burial, and resurrection just as certainly as Paul ever preached it. And yet, they tell me that Jesus did not preach the gospel! It is strange—strange indeed. He preached the gospel of faith in all of its fullness, the gospel of salvation. He had the power to forgive sins through faith in himself, and not another.

The Dr. says: "The apostles were charter members of the church," who went in, I suppose, without Christian baptism.

I should like to know what Scripture he finds that in, about being charter members, going in without baptism. That is a kind of a *fix up* to avoid the great difficulty of getting one hundred and twenty original disciples into the Christian Church, without Christian baptism. John's baptism was Christian baptism. That administered by Christ was Christian baptism, and it was before the day of Pentecost.

Acts i. 26: "And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Mathias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." They were transacting church business, by divine authority, before the day of Pentecost.

But Mr. Campbell is of no more authority than the Dr. I suppose that he is known the best. The very name of *Campbellite Church*, was from Alexander Campbell; and a great ado is made over his writings and positions, but we have heard nothing of the kind over this gentleman. And, just now, he announces himself as a higher authority in his church than Mr. Campbell!

He says: "We take the Bible as our rule, faith and practice." I wish to show you, dear friends, that he is a little mistaken about taking the Bible. I quote from Mr. Lard's Address, p. 18—a funeral address delivered after the death of Mr. Campbell, containing a little biographical sketch. Speaking of Mr. Campbell's great ability to discover the truth, he says: "That truth lay on the sacred page as much for others as for him. Why, then, did others not discover it? Is it no small merit to say that he alone did what none before him had done, and this to the glory of Christ and the happiness of man."

Again, he says, on p. 25: "As his own conceptions of this blessed book began to assume accuracy and definiteness, he began to mold and shape the thoughts of others. Immense crowds flocked to his appointments, to hear him. They were delighted with his noble plea for the Bible and the Bible

alone. As he taught men how to read it (for at that time, let it astound none, men did not know), their appreciation of it arose; and as their appreciation of the Bible arose, their appreciation of human creeds sank; and their appreciation of creeds once on the wane, could never be stopped."

Then, according to the testimony of Mr. Lard, the gentleman's church would never, so far as we can conjecture, have known the truth of God's Word, had it not been for Mr. Campbell. He discovered that which none before him had done; and then taught them how to read the Bible; because they did not even know how to read it until he taught them! And he *began to mould their thoughts!* I have had my sympathies aroused very much sometimes, when men have yielded their minds and thoughts to be *moulded* by great men. Let us be careful how we give up our thoughts thus to be moulded.

Now, again, we wish your attention to the fact that I deny that they are governed by God's Word. I make it one of my negative arguments, *that the Disciples do not take the Bible as the rule of their faith and practice.* In the former discussion, my worthy friend repudiated one of the clauses of the Lord's prayer, as not in point at the present time; and when one of his good brethren before him repeated the Lord's prayer, he contradicted the statement I made about it, forgetting what had been stated, and, it seemed, tried to get the old brother to take back his prayer. But Mr. Campbell himself repudiates that form of prayer, because it says "Thy kingdom come." How, then, can they take the *Bible*, when they lay part of it aside, like an old almanac, out of date.

In regard to the plan of salvation, Jesus said to the poor, weeping, penitent woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee." The New Testament of the gentleman's church begins with the 38th verse of the 2d chapter of Acts, and they only take Mr. Campbell's interpretation of *that* which, I think, is a misconception.

Now, in regard to the transaction of the church business, Mr. Campbell says (Christian System, p. 89): "No private individual has a right to accuse any person before the whole community. The charge, in no case, is to be preferred before the whole congregation. Such a procedure is without precedent in the law, or in the gospel—in any well regulated society, church, or State. If, then, any brother fall into any public offense, those privy to it notify the elders of the church, or those for the time being presiding over it, of the fact, and of the evidence on which they rely. The matter is then in the hands of the proper persons. They prosecute the investigation of it, and, on denial of the accused, seek to convict him of the allegation." And then, again, he says: "The Christian Church engrosses old men, young men, and babes in Christ. Shall the voice of a babe be heard, or counted as a vote in a case of discipline? What is the use of bishops in a church, if all are to rule—of judges, if all are judges of fact and law?" Thus showing that the administration of the discipline of the church is given into the hands of an eldership —given to the ruling eldership out of the hands of the congregation. Now, if you turn to Matt. chapter 18, and, commencing with the 15th verse, you will find, "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." "Tell it to the bishop," Mr. Campbell would say. My friend's church would say, tell it to the ruling elders; but Jesus says, tell it to the church, and the church is composed of its members. "*If he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.*"

And we find it was *the church* that elected Matthias; it was *the church* that selected the deacons; it was *the church* that received and excluded members. The church government adopted by the gentleman's church is unauthorized in God's Word; therefore, it is not the Church of Christ, because it is not governed by the Word of God.

I advance now to the *fifth* negative argument in my line, *His is not the Church of Christ, because it introduces improper materials into the building.* Mr. H. T. Anderson states that "The disciples baptize men to make them Christians." *They baptize the unpardoned sinner that he may become a Christian,* is the doctrine of the gentleman's church. Again, Dr. Lucas says: "*We are baptized into the death of Christ, where we meet the blood, and then we become new creatures.*" He, then, baptizes those who are not made new creatures in Christ; he baptizes those who are not children of God to make them children of God, contrary, as we think, to the Word of God. Again: The Dr. said, in the Canton debate, "We baptize men that they may become Christians, or children of God." This is his exact language: *We baptize men that they may become Christians, or children of God!* Mr. Lard, in his "Letter to an Inquiring Baptist," which was published in tract form, eighth letter, page 4, says: "When we cross the line out of the world into the kingdom, we cease to be Jew, cease to be Gentile; and when we cease to be these, we cease to be children of the wicked one, and become children of God. But we never cease to be Jew and Gentile till we enter Christ, and we never enter into him till baptized into him. Then, therefore, do we cease to be children of Satan, and become children of God,"—showing that, according to Moses Lard, the Disciples profess to baptize the children of Satan, in order to make them the children of God. *A child of the devil*—when he is not a child of God—they baptize him that he may become a child of God! Where in God's Word is the authority for baptizing

the children of Satan that they may become the children of God? We have testimony upon testimony upon this subject. I will read from Mr. Campbell's Christian System, p. 193: "Whatever the act of faith may be, it necessarily becomes the line of discrimination between the two states before described. On this side, and on that, mankind are in quite different states. On the one side, they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; on the other, they are in a state of condemnation. This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion; and that this act may appear obvious to all, we shall be at some pains to confirm and illustrate it." Thus, showing that on one side of the *line* called immersion, men are irreconciled to God, and are children of the devil, according to Mr. Campbell; but that on the other, when they are reconciled, they hate God no more. Mr. Campbell teaches, in his philosophy of religion, that *love* is the fruit of the spirit which is given after baptism. They baptize persons when they are not yet reconciled to God, according to their own testimony. Mr. Richardson, page 78, in his "Religious Reformation," makes "love, joy, peace, and righteousness" the fruits of the spirit received after baptism. And, again, Mr. Campbell has taught that in regeneration there is no change of the affections. He applies the term regeneration, however, to baptism. Christian Baptist, p. 131, he says: "No new faculties are created in the human mind, nor are any of the old ones annihilated; no new passions, nor affections are communicated." * * * "It appears, then, that the faculties of the human spirit, and the affections of the human mind, are affected no more by regeneration than the height of the human stature, or the corpulency of the human body, or the color of the human skin, are affected by it;" showing that in their reformed generation there is no change.

According to the testimony of the Doctor, according to the

testimony of Mr. Anderson, according to the testimony of Mr. Lard, and according to the testimony of Mr. Campbell, the Disciples baptize men who are not Christians, men who are not reconciled to God, men whose consciences are corrupt, in order that they may become the children of God. Remember, dear friends, that there must be preparation. I quote Eph. ii. 8-10: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." *Created in Christ Jesus unto good works.* This new creation is by and through faith. And, again, in 2d Corinthians v. 17, we have: "Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, *he is* a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." Here is this wonderful, this grand, this glorious change from death to life—being made a new creature in Christ Jesus.

Then, again, 1st Peter ii. 5: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Lively stones representing God's children; and then built up as a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up sacrifice to God. 1st Kings vi. 7: When the temple was in building it went up without the sound of a hammer out of those materials that were prepared beforehand. The stone was not placed into the building in order to be prepared; it was first prepared and then placed into the building, because it was prepared; and so in the spiritual temple, which was represented and typified by the ancient temple, the spiritual stones must be prepared and then put into the building—not to prepare them, but because they are prepared. My friend's church is not the true church of Christ, because it introduces improper materials into the building, with the design, that they may be prepared by their introduction. Again, it is——. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' FIFTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I shall refer to a statement or two made by Dr. Clark, and then notice the points presented by the gentleman, and proceed with my argument. Dr. Clark, in presenting the point in regard to the name presents it just this way. He does not found his remarks upon a little *if*, as the gentleman has told you, but he says: "it is evident they had the name Christian from their Master." And, again, the word *krematizo* in our common text, which we translate "were called," signifies in the New Testament to appoint, warned, or nominated by divine direction." That is what Mr. Clark says upon the question.

The gentleman refers to my denial of that letter again. Well, that is too small a matter to spend our time upon. But I deny that Mr. Campbell ever asked for it, and I ask him to prove it.

But Christ preached the gospel in fact, he says, while he was here on earth. I ask this audience to examine the divine record and see if Christ ever preached that he had died, that he had been buried, that he had triumphed over the dead. No, Christ never preached those things as having an existence in fact. He spoke of them as something yet to come, as something yet future, just as every other one who preached them did. These things were yet to be accomplished—were to be accomplished, and they did not preach them in fact until after they existed, and they could not be preached until after they were facts—until after they had occurred.

One other point. The gentleman referred to it again, and I omitted to notice it in my former address—and I want to refer to it now—in regard to the kingdom, the beginning of the kingdom, and so on. He spoke of the twelve apostles of the lamb being placed for the foundation. Well, now, the position of the gentleman is that the kingdom was established in the days of John the Baptist, and while Christ was here personally in the world. Well, suppose that we admit for the sake of the argument that the kingdom was established then. Then we have the twelve apostles in the foundation of the kingdom established. Well, I want to know what twelve? Was not Judas one of the twelve then? Matthias certainly was elected to fill Judas' place after that. If, then, the foundation was established by the twelve apostles in the days of John, then Judas was one of them; and now the gentleman has to take one of two positions, either that Judas, an unconverted man, was in the foundation, or, if converted, that the saints of God may fall away, for Judas was lost. He has to give up his doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, or he has to put Judas in the foundation, though unconverted. One of the two he has to take, whether he wants to or not, and he can't help it. That is all we have to say on this subject just now. But he refers to those cases where Jesus said, "Thy sins are forgiven thee. Thy faith hath saved thee." We have shown that the kingdom was not then established, and those were cases that occurred under the immediate presence of Jesus Christ himself, while here upon the earth, and he had a right to say and to do just precisely as he pleased. But he gave the apostles a commission when he went away that was to control and govern them in the establishment of the kingdom, and that they might faithfully and successfully carry out that commission, he told them to return to Jerusalem, and remain there until they were endued with power from on high, that they might be qualified to carry out that

commission—the great commission of his kingdom, and of his reign—when the kingdom should be established, when they should start upon their great commission in the kingdom, under this second commission, to preach the gospel to all nations, to every creature.

But, "improper material," and he talks about the temple. Well, I wonder if we, as a people, do not preach for the proper preparation of the material; and I wonder if we do not require and demand fully as much as the gentleman. The teachings of his church, or of some of its authorities, at least, are, that we are all justified by faith alone, and that is the preparation. Then, if sinners are justified by faith alone, that is the preparation of the material for the building. Well, if the gentleman is right, we have our material prepared just as well as he has, for we demand that the individual believes with all his heart in the Lord, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that he can not be saved unless he does believe he is Lord, and if that is the preparation of his material, certainly it is the preparation of ours, prepares ours just as well as his; and if we require something more, which the Lord has demanded, than simply faith, surely we do not make our preparation any the less. And I can not see what point the gentleman can make in this case; for if his material is prepared, ours is equally as well prepared, for we demand fully as much as he in order to this preparation. But he talks about, and refers to a fact, and admits finally—and this is the only time that he has made the statement in all the discussions we have had—that Mr. Campbell takes the position that baptism does not change the affections. He says that Mr. Campbell says, that regeneration is baptism, and baptism is regeneration, of course, and it does not change the affections of the heart. I think the reporter has improved the gentleman very considerably upon this point, at least, that baptism does not change the affections of the heart. Well, who sup-

posed that it did? Who supposed that baptism ever did change the affections of the heart, or that it gave a man a new faculty? He has the same faculties after he becomes a Christian that he had before, precisely, and the difference in the man is, that the man, or his faculties and his powers, are now working in a different direction. He has the same faculties of mind, and the same faculties of soul, after he becomes a Christian, that he had before. The difference is, they are changed in the direction of their action. They are now consecrated to the service of God. It does not change his appearance at all. If he was a black man before he became a Christian, he is a black man still. If he was a white man before, he is a white man still; and this is all that Mr. Campbell meant in the point to which my friend has referred. But, then, he must quote Campbell. It is in his lesson, and he must say it, and he can not get along without it. I tell you, the gentleman would be as dumb as a night hawk if you were to take away from him the works of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Lard. Why, he wouldn't have anything to say at all. His part of the book that we expect to result from this debate would be a very small affair, were it not for what he borrows from Campbell and Lard, and a few others. But we desire to invite your attention now to what he stated with regard to Hephzi-bah, as the new name. Now, here in this chapter, 62d chapter of Isaiah, we have, in the 4th verse, "And thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah," and in the last verse, "And thou shalt be called Sought out." Now, then, if the name is given in the 62d chapter, as in the one place, they are called Hephzi-bah—my beloved, or, the one in whom I delight—when the word is properly rendered, "my delight—my delight is in her," and now, here, in the closing part of the chapter, last verse, is "called Sought out," I want to know of the gentleman, which one of these names is the name, if it is found in this chapter. Now, I undertake to say that there is as

much authority for calling them "Sought out" as for calling them "my delight is in her"—just as much in the one case as there is in the other; and, according to the gentleman's position, in the chapter, instead of having one new name, we have simply two new names. They are not new, after all. "My delight is in her:" that is no new name—that is no new name, at all—and so "Sought out" is no new name. The new name is not there, but if the name is in that chapter, then there are two names, instead of one.

But, then, we refer again to Amos ix. 12, and also to the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where James quotes from the prophecy of Amos, and refers it to the Christian dispensation, where he speaks of the name—"upon whom my name is called," and "that are called by my name."

Now, I undertake to say that James understood the matter correctly, when he was referring to these prophecies, in regard to the name, to the Christian dispensation, or economy of things, and every other apostle understood it precisely the same way; for when James quoted the passage, he referred it to the Christian dispensation. If he had been wrong, then the other apostles would have filed their objections; but it is evident they all agreed on the question, and James was right in referring these prophecies to the Christian dispensation, at which time the new name was given. So much for Hephzibah, for the present.

Now I proceed with my argument. We had just stated, when our time expired, that the disciples of Jesus Christ were deliberating upon one of the most important questions that had ever disturbed the church of God. That question was: May the Gentiles become Christians and be saved, without being circumcised, and without becoming Jews by proselytism? In order to prove that the Gentiles may be saved without being circumcised, and keeping the law of Moses, James quotes Amos ix. 12, and "heathen" in Amos, and "Gentiles" in Acts,

mean the same people. Now, if James had not understood the prophecy of Amos to apply to the church of Christ in the gospel day, he could not have used this scripture in defense of his position, and had the other apostles believed that this prophecy had a literal meaning, and is yet to be fulfilled in some far distant day, they surely would have made their objections to James' application of it. But we hear of no objection, hence we must conclude that they were all of one mind and one heart upon this subject. And, further, we see that according to this the Lord's people were to be called by his name in the gospel dispensation—"to be called by my name"—as in Amos, and "upon whom my name is called," as in the Acts, meaning the same thing. Now, I ask, how is it that the Lord's people were called by his name? Are they so called now? Or if they have been, what is meant by being called by his name?

In answer to this question, and in further illustration of the position now assumed, I will call your attention to the following considerations: The Greek verb *epikaloumai* is both in the passive and middle voice, and signifies both passive and active. In the New Testament, where its passive voice occurs, it uniformly signifies *surname* or *called;* when its middle voice occurs it as uniformly signifies to invoke, call upon, or appeal to. I will bring to view the texts in the New Testament where the passive of this verb is used and commonly translated surname. Mat. x. 3: "James, the son of Alphæus, and Lebbæus whose *surname* was Thaddæus. Luke xxii. 36: "Then entered Satan into Judas, *surnamed* Iscariot." Acts i. 23: "and they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was *surnamed* Justus." Acts iv. 36: "And Joses, who by the apostles was *surnamed* Barnabas." Acts x. 5: "And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose *surname* is Peter." And the same phrase occurs in the 18th and 32d verses; also in chapter xi. 13. And, again, Acts xii. 12: "He came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose *surname*

was Mark." The same occurs in the 25th verse; also Acts xv. 22: "Judas, *surnamed* Barsabas." James says in his Epistles, 2d chapter, 7th verse: "Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by which you are called—or *surname*—for it is the same word. "Undoubtedly this name blasphemed was Christ or Christian. Now notice the proof. Amos says in chaper ix. 12: "And of all the heathen which are called by my name." James quotes this passage in Acts xv. 17: "And all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." Thus it is demonstrable, my brethren, that the phrase "to be called by my name" is the same as "upon whom my name is called." This phraseology is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, and signifies their surnames attached to their proper names. Israel was one of those names, for in this name is *El*, the Hebrew name for God. This was the name given by the divine one to Jacob, and by this name were all his children called. "The children of *Israel*"—thus the phrase the Gentiles who were "called by my name," or on "whom thy name is called"—is the same as that by which you are called, or surname, which we think all must see and agree to be Christian, after Christ. Thus to be called by the Lord's name, according to Amos ix. 12, is to be called Christian. In order to make this matter plainer, if possible, we ask you to examine Daniel ix. 19: "O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name." Now, on what other principle was this true except the one that has already been named. El, one of the Hebrew names for God is embodied in the word Israel. Hence, whenever the name Israel was pronounced, the name of God was pronounced. When God gave Jacob this name, he placed his own name upon him. Well, then, might the prophets say: "Thy people are called by thy name." Here the name of Christ is embosomed in the name *Christian*, and, hence, whenever the name is

pronounced the name of Christ is spoken. Surely the apostle had reference to this fact when he said: "If you be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are you." See 1st Peter iv. 14; according to the same passage, "to suffer as a *Christian*, or to suffer for the name of *Christ*, you are happy. But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief: or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yea, if any man suffer as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this *name*." We quote here the version as given by the Baptist Union, their translation, and their translation of this passage is as we have quoted: "if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this *name*"—in this name *Christian*. Thus are the phrases: "in the name of Christ," and "as a Christian" used interchangeably—as both mean the same thing. The same fact is referred to by the apostle, when he says: "Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before their judgment seats. Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by which you are called?" See James ii. 6, 7. This worthy name was surely the name of Christ, or Christians, by which they were called. How appropriate, then, was the response of the king when he had heard the argument of Paul in behalf of Christianity: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." See Acts xxvi. 28. How many are just in the king's condition, almost ready to abandon the world and everything sectarian, and to receive the Christian faith, and to adopt the Christian rule of life, and to take upon themselves the Lord's worthy name by which the disciples of Christ were called. But, alas, he was only *almost* persuaded.

But, further, the prophet Isaiah, filled with the spirit of inspiration, looked forward to the gospel day, and said: "You shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord shall slay thee and call His servants by another name." Again: "Thou shalt be called by a new name,

which the mouth of the Lord shall name." See Isaiah lxii. 15, and, again, Isaiah lxii. 2. Now, I ask, what is this new name? Dr. Clark says this new name is "Christian;" so says Dr. Davies. Now, if these scholars are correct, then the name Christian is given by the mouth of the Lord. If this new name is not Christian, then this prophecy has never been fulfilled, for this is the only new name by which the people of God are called in the New Testament. They are called saints, because of the purity of their hearts and lives; but that is an Old Testament name. They are called brethren, but this is no new name. David said, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." —Psalms cxxxiii. 1. They are called disciples, but this name was known to the Old Testament saints; this name was in existence during that dispensation, and was once applied to the students of philosophy. Indeed, I can call to mind no new name by which the followers of Christ were called, save the name "Christian." It was a new name—emphatically a new name—a name unknown to the Jews and Gentiles till Paul and Barnabas had assembled with the church in Antioch a whole year, and had taught much people. Of course, it was while these divinely authorized teachers were fully instructing the people in the holy will of God, that the disciples were called Christians first, and then was fulfilled the word of the Lord, which said, you shall be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name; and again, in Revelations iii. 8, we have this name referred to again, and in Ephesians iii. 15, we have it here referred to as the name by which the whole family, both in heaven and on earth, is named—the family name, the name given to the family instituted by the divine authority after the ascension of our adorable Lord, when he had become the King of kings and Lord of lords—when he had been coronated at the right hand of the Majesty on High, and had sent forth the

Spirit upon the apostles, according to his promise, which was to guide them into all truth—the name by which that family, then instituted, was called, when Jew and Gentile were brought together into this one family, and when all differences between Jew and Gentile were taken away, and when they were made one in Christ Jesus the Lord, the foundation and head of the church.

But, we call your attention to our sixth argument. We state that we have the scriptural officers of the church. The gentleman has been running entirely too fast. If he would just wait and examine the arguments that we submit, and pay his respects to the proofs that we offer, I think, at least, that the discussion, when it shall have become a book, published and read by the people, that it would read at least a little better. But, then, he must exercise his own will and pleasure in regard to this matter. We have the scriptural officers of the church: First, Evangelists; second, elders, or bishops; and third, deacons. I presume these officers he will not deny —he will not deny that they are scriptural. He will not deny that they are the officers presented in the Scriptures and recognized now as the officers of the church, or kingdom of the living God on earth.

We have not time to discuss this question, presuming that so far as these official characters are concerned, that they will be recognized. We simply say, however, that the Scripture by which these official characters are sustained, are found in Acts xx. 17, 18; and 1st Peter v. 2; and Titus i. 5-7; and 1st Timothy v. 17, and Philippians i. 1. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S FIFTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: Your attention is invited to the reply. He said we have Christ preached before his death, but he did not preach the gospel *in fact*. I still affirm that the gospel was preached *in fact*, and *in power*, and that to the salvation of men. His death upon the cross had not yet occurred, but the efficacy of that atoning blood extended as much back to Abel's day as it extends to us now. He was as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world. My friend's doctrine, that he advocates here, borders on Unitarianism; it seems to me that it is entirely unauthorized from the Word of God. He talks about his being coronated on the day of Pentecost, and yet he did not get his doctrine from Mr. Campbell! Where in the Bible do you find anything about it. It is not there. When he was born in the manger, he was the *King* of heaven and earth, and, although as to his flesh, but a little babe, his omnipotent power supported the universe of God. I understand that he is in his divinity, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and the government is upon his shoulders. The Dr. has failed to notice the argument that I made—that when HE gave the commission, the whole power of heaven and earth was in his hands—and yet he tells you he was not a King! Enough on this point.

But who are the twelve apostles mentioned here, Rev. xxi. 14? He thinks that he has sprung a difficulty in regard to the twelve foundation stones, because Judas was in; and if Judas was in the foundation, we will have an apostate. Well,

I don't think there is any difficulty in regard to the question. I learn, Mat. xix. 28, that the Saviour said that "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." I do not understand him as having reference literally there to Judas, because, in his mind, he already embraced Matthias, who was the true apostle; and this is sustained by a fact, that we read in the 1st chapter of Acts, commencing with the 21st verse, "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Thus showing that it was to fill the office vacated by Judas. He only fell from his *office*—not from grace. He must have companied with the apostles all the time, beginning from the baptism of John; consequently, it is probable when Jesus said, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," he referred to the true apostle, Matthias, who was present, according to this statement. And, then, notice it is said, "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all *men*, shew whether of these two thou *hast chosen*"—showing that the Lord had already chosen him, and that the disciples were only to discover that choice that God himself had made—"that he might take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias."

Will he answer this question: *Was Judas a child of God* at any time of his life? Another difficulty for you. You don't answer questions very freely. It will go to record that he fails to answer. Was Judas a true child of God? If you say so, I will then bring the difficulties upon you. He won't say it, I reckon.

But, then, again: The Dr. says that some of the Baptist

authors say, "faith alone, and we have as much preparation *as they!*" If he understands the Baptist authorities, he knows that they say that "men are justified by grace through faith;" that they speak of that faith that has been preceded by repentance; for repentance is essential to faith with the heart, a preparation that is a little different from his, as we will show when we come to that point.

But he says the reporter seems to have improved your unworthy servant somewhat. Well, it has had a very wonderful effect, it seems to me, on the Dr., and so, it seems, we are both benefitted by having a reporter.

"But, if I failed to quote Mr. Campbell and others, my part of the book would be very small." Well, brethren, if Mr. Campbell and Mr. Lard, and those associated with them, had not lived, his church would never have been heard of at all; and if we didn't have them to quote from, we wouldn't find out a solitary thing about his church. We are discussing the church now that he at this time is identified with; and all the time he is talking about Pentecost—talking about what took place in the times of the apostles—he makes no proof concerning his church. A Universalist might get up and investigate and discuss all these great theories back there, and then conclude, "Now, the Universalists' is the true church, because we hold so and so!" I am not comparing the gentleman's doctrine to Universalism, only by way of illustrating the awkwardness of the argument. Suppose that during the time of our Southern Confederacy—for I was in it, you know—suppose at that time some individual should have concluded that the Confederacy was the ancient Roman government, and had delivered a speech on the commencement of the Roman government. Now, suppose he had said, "My *theory* of the commencement of the Roman government is right; therefore, the Southern Confederacy is identical with the Roman government, and is a part of the Roman government itself!" That is just about as

good an argument as the Dr. has made. Why don't you bring your "therefore" to bear on your church? The true church was set up on the day of Pentecost; *therefore*, the church set up by Alexander Campbell, in 1827, is the true church of Christ! I would like a few conclusions from your arguments. It seems to me they are very far off from *your* church characteristics.

But, again, it is the *name Christian, the name that the mouth of the Lord hath named.* He is troubled a little about Hephzi-bah. Whether it was Hephzi-bah, or some other name, he can take his choice—which one he pleases. But it certainly was not *Christian*. The new name that God was to call the people at that future time is *Hephzi-bah*, and if he says it is not, then he contradicts God Almighty; and if that is the name—the new name—his church has got, I wish all the people to call it Hephzi-bah from this time forward. Certainly, that is the name, and if he don't intend to call his church that, why did he introduce such an argument? *Hephzi-bah* is the name.

"They blaspheme the worthy name by which you are called." Do you know what the name of the Saviour is, Dr. Lucas? The angel spake unto Mary (Luke i. 31): "Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*." If you are called by the name of the Saviour you must be called by the name of JESUS or *Jesuits*—and I believe there is a denomination by that name. Suppose I am discussing with a Romish Jesuit, and he says: "I contend that we are the visible church of Christ, because we have got the right name. We are named after Jesus—we are Jesuits!"

Dear friends, it seems to me that this argument is unworthy of this occasion. I can not help but feel so. I ask in what chapter and verse in God's Word he finds "Christian" in connection with church? He has in his proposition "Christian Church." All denominations of professed Christians use the name Christian, and if his argument proves anything, it proves

that all denominations are the true church, because they use it in every church—every one. But it does not prove they are the true church, and he dare not affirm it; and consequently his whole argument is lost, and lost forever, unless he can find the name "Christian Church" given by divine authority.

I ask him the question again: *Can an individual out of the kingdom of Christ be a child of God?* But he will not answer. In the Blandinville debate he said that "out of the kingdom there is no remission of sins." In this discussion he says there are saints, witnesses of God all along down through the dark ages of the world. I understand him that way, and this being so, they are in the kingdom, and therefore the kingdom has stood, according to Dr. Lucas. That being so, he has said if there is a true succession, his church fails, because he knows that it has no succession. It started out of a movement of which Alexander Campbell was the recognized head; and it started in America, and became a church about 1827.

He says: "We have the scriptural officers." Well, I deny that, and as he has not brought out his proof I will wait for him to develop his line of argument a little further upon this subject.

I wish to call your attention again to the fact that the gentleman's church, which he calls the Christian Church, is not the church of Christ, because it introduces improper material into the organization. He don't deny that they introduce those who are irreconciled in order to reconcile them; children of Satan in order to make them children of God. That is the point I made against his church. And you remember it was said in John iv. 1, that the Pharisees had heard "that James made and baptized more disciples than John, though he baptized not himself, but his disciples. He *made* disciples, and then baptized them. The gentleman's church baptizes men to make them disciples. There is where it is wrong, and fearfully wrong. I do not affirm that every one that goes in

among them is destitute of discipleship, but I am taking up the theory—the doctrine, and the practices of his church.

But then, again, 1st John, iv. 7, 8, shows that persons must be children of God before they are baptized. "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God: and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." I would like for the Doctor to notice some of my questions that I ask, and I ask them all kindly. I wish to know his views. I would like for him to say *yes* or *no*. He can do as he pleases, and answer in his own way and time. I wish to know whether or not his church *will baptize a man before he loves God?*—whether they profess to do it?—whether *he* would do so? John says: whosoever loveth, is born of God." *If he loves, he is born of God;* and if he *loves* God before baptism, he is *born of God* before baptism; and he is not only a son of God, but he knows God —has a spiritual knowledge of God. There is no escape from this.

And then the 3d chapter and 14th verse of the same book, 1st Epistle of John, we have this: "We know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." Then, when we love God we have passed out of a state of death into life, or, are children of God; we know that we have passed from death to life, not because we have joined the church—not because we have been baptized—not because we have eaten of the supper, but we know it because we *love* the brethren. And this love of the brethren must come before one is qualified for baptism, or for admission into the Church of Christ.

I affirm, as my sixth negative argument, that the gentleman's church with which he stands identified is not the church of Christ, *because it inverts the order of the commandment of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.* They do not obey that injunction of the apostle found in 1st Cor. xi. 2, where

Paul says: "I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I have delivered *them* to you." They do not keep the ordinances as they are delivered. Dr. Lucas said of the sinner, that "faith changes his heart, repentance his life, and baptism his state." Mr. Franklin presents the same order, and all their writers, from Campbell down, put it, *faith, repentance,* and *baptism.* Well, I wish your attention to the Scriptures in regard to the order. Jesus preached, Mark i. 15, saying, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." I suppose Jesus understood himself, and understood how to preach; but I guess you will not find any of the Disciples preaching that way. They don't think it reasonable to preach like Jesus did—in that order. "But," says one, "how are you going to repent before faith? He that comes to God must believe that He is"—as found in Heb. xi. 6—"and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Now, I grant, in coming to God, he must believe that *He is.* Dear friends, we must distinguish between believing that *God is,* and *believing in Christ, in the sense of trust.* The devils believe that God is; wicked men, that hate God, and blaspheme His holy name, believe that God is, and that Christ is His Son, but they do not *believe in him,* they do not love him or believe in him with the heart. But when we come to understand the meaning of the word faith—the Greek word *pistis* —used in the New Testament, it means *trust;* faith with the heart includes *trust,* the faith of trust in Christ follows repentance unto life; and they are inseparable, the one from the other—I say, faith with the heart is inseparable from repentance which is wrought by a godly sorrow.

Well, now, with this explanation, we pass to the statement of the Saviour. He says, Mat. xxi. 32: "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen *it,* repented not afterward, that ye might believe

him." *Repentance in order to faith.* The gentleman says that *metamelomai* can not be used here in the sense of repentance to life. What kind of repentance was it, then? In this passage it means more than regret. It is true, it is not the same word ordinarily used in the Bible to indicate repentance unto life; but it is here used in such a situation that it can certainly mean nothing else. And if it does not mean that, will the Dr. please tell us what it does mean? "Ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

Again, Paul, Acts xx. 21, speaking of his own labors among the Ephesians, he said: "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." The gentleman's church don't preach that way. But every time both requirements, repentance and faith, are mentioned in the Bible, I will say from the first word in Genesis to the last line in Revelations—every time both requirements are mentioned, repentance is always first; and it is not so by accident. The human soul is so constituted that a man hating God can not believe and trust in him while he hates him. But there comes repentance—and there can be no repentance without a change—the very word *metanoeō* denotes a change in the human affections. When one is hating another, he can not say, "I believe in him," till that repentance comes. I give an illustration. Now, some of us were in Tennessee during the reign of a certain Governor there, but we did not all *believe in him.* The first letters of his name were W. G.—I believe you have heard of him—Brownlow. Some of us didn't fully believe in him; and while we knew that he was Governor, and that he was the rewarder of men that diligently sought him politically, still we didn't *believe in him,* and, I tell you, they could not have believed in him until there was a change in their affections toward him, and that change involved repentance toward that Governor. This is the philosophy of the human soul. When we consider

that we are hating God, we never can believe in him, or trust him until that hate is removed; and in the removal of that hatred is repentance. There is no escape from it.

I affirm still further that the gentleman's church is not the true church, because it does not observe the supper in the order which God requires; which is repentance, faith, burial, and baptism, and the Lord's Supper at the Lord's table in his kingdom. The gentleman's church practices what is ordinarily called "open communion," with those that they recognize as children of Satan—those who are not immersed; because they say those who are not immersed, are not children of God. Here is what Mr. Lard says, p. 49 of Lard's Quarterly, for 1863: "Hence, when I claim the right to forbid the unimmersed to commune, my claim has this extent only: that as a teacher of the truth, I must tell him he has not the right to commune. This done, and I can proceed no further. If he still insists that he has the right to commune, and communes, I am clear. But in this case I would hand him neither the loaf, nor the cup." Mr. Lard continues: "A Christian man is a member of the body of Christ and my brother, and I would commune with him in a loving spirit, though I met him in the vilest sinks of Rome. Hell can rear no barriers so high, nor sin dig ditches so deep and foul, as to shut out from my fellowship him whom Christ has washed in his own blood. And though I admired a man with my whole strength, and loved him as my own flesh, and even wept over his deficiencies as feelingly as a mother weeps over the deformity of her babe, yet would I not 'eat' with him, unless he was of the 'one body.' But when I concede that there are Christians among the parties of the day, let me not be accused of concealment. I recognize no human being as a Christian who has not been immersed. Men may call this by what name they see fit, it moves me not." Mr. Lard says that Luther was not a Christian, and Calvin was never a Christian, and so with all

the unimmersed Pedobaptists, but he thinks they will be saved in heaven somehow. That is very singular, but then we have very singular notions to deal with. Again, page 51: "Near the commencement of the present controversy, a question was raised as to the practice of our churches in the premises. A word on this is demanded. Our churches in the West, I am sorry to say, without an exception known to me, permit the unimmersed to communion." Here is proof that the gentleman's church does not keep the ordinances as they were delivered, and practices—contrary to the testimony of Alexander Campbell, contrary to the testimony of Mr. Lard, contrary to the testimony of God's Word—what they call open communion. Mr. Lard says, p. 52 of the same Quarterly: "In the outset of the current reformation, our motto was: *And thus, saith the Lord, for every article of our faith, a precept, or a precedent for all we do.* In the light of this cherished postulate, what defense can we plead for our act, when we set down to commune with the unimmersed." What can we plead, says Mr. Lard? what apology can we offer, when, contrary to the teaching of God's Word, we set down with the unbaptized, to commune with those that you do not recognize as being the children of God. In Luke xxii. 29, 30: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom," and so on; showing that the Lord's table is to be found in the Lord's kingdom alone—nowhere else; "*Eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.*" And thus it is seen that the church that stands out before the world *changing*, *inverting* and *perverting* the order of God's commandments, can not be that identical kingdom that Christ established—that church that has stood to the present time. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Third Evening.

DR. LUCAS' SIXTH ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have assembled again for the purpose of continuing our investigation of the question we have had up before you now for two nights past. I propose, before I advance with my argument, to notice a few points presented by my friend in his closing speech of last evening. He referred again to the preaching of the gospel in fact; he affirmed that the gospel in fact was preached before ever Jesus died, before he was buried, and before he rose from the dead.

I feel very confident that this audience will see that it is impossible to preach the gospel *in fact*, the gospel embracing these facts, until after they have *become* facts, until Jesus has *actually* died, been buried, and has triumphed over the dark empire of death. But my friend states in answer to the difficulty presented with reference to the twelve apostles who constituted the foundation quoted by him from Revelations, that Matthias was embraced at the time in the mind of Jesus, the Christ, and, consequently, Matthias was one of the twelve apostles who entered into that foundation. Now, this proposition I most positively deny, and call for the proof. None of the apostles entered into that foundation, even according to the position taken by my friend, until they were called. They

were not called until after John—according to his statement last night—until after John was imprisoned. They were not called until after that time, and, as a matter of course, entered not into the foundation until after they were called. But the kingdom was not given to the apostles until Jesus went away. He went away forty days after his resurrection, and ten days before the first Pentecost, after his ascension. This is bringing the beginning of the kingdom down very close to the first Pentecost, after the resurrection of the Lord. But we state, by these admissions, that we have succeeded in getting the gentleman much nearer Pentecost than when we first commenced our investigation. He said, at first, the kingdom was established in the days of John, and that John actually preached the existence of the kingdom already established, and now we have it admitted that not until after the apostles were called did Jesus give the kingdom to them, neither then, until he went away. They were not called until after John was in prison; consequently the kingdom could not actually be preached as existing prior to that time. But Matthias was not called until after Jesus had ascended to the Father, consequently could not be embraced in the foundation, according to the gentleman's position. But this statement, that Jesus, embraced in his mind Matthias, was the position taken by my friend, in order to avoid one of two difficulties that were presented to him. The first of which was, that in order to have his twelve apostles embraced within the period that he announces the kingdom as visibly existing, that Judas must be embraced in that foundation; that Judas must be part of it, and if Judas was a part of the foundation, then there is another difficulty that presents itself to the mind. As Judas fell from his position, then the idea that there is a possibility of falling from grace forces itself upon the mind, and one of these two positions, or rather, we might say, both of them the gentleman from his position is forced to take.

But with regard to Matthias again, we simply say that we deny his statement and call for the proof.

But my friend inquired last night, where were the "wherefores," why did I not present a few "therefores." Well, I wish to refer to a point or two, not because the matter is in strict accordance with my own ideas in a discussion of the kind, but simply because the gentleman himself has introduced it. You recollect the last evening, in order to destroy in your minds the force of my position with reference to the name now contended for he stated, suppose I call a goat a sheep, will that make it a sheep, and therefore my proposition affirms falsely. There is one therefore for you. But, again, he told us on last evening that he was a member, or was connected with the Southern Confederacy, therefore I suppose my proposition affirms falsely, because he was in the Southern Confederacy. Now, that is almost all the connection that I can see that such a reference has to the discussion of the proposition that we have before us. I can not see what his connection with the Southern Confederacy can have with settling a Bible question in the hearing of this audience, but probably he thought that it might do him some good as an argument, and he would like to obtain favor with somebody, in some way, and that was the best plan.

But my friend, in a former discussion, when we took the position that the name Christian was derived from Christ, said that the gentleman is in a difficulty upon that question. He said the name of Christ is nothing more than an official title, an official name, a name that has reference to an office. That is the position he took in both our former discussions, and the true name he said is Jesus, and, therefore, we should, if we derive the name of the church from the name of the one we serve, we should derive it from the name Jesus, and hence, he spoke of Jesuits, and so on, and you will recollect his remarks upon that subject. He did not introduce this difficulty

last night, but I simply refer to the former discussion, because he has been in the habit of referring to it time and again. Well, we presented this answer for the consideration of those that we addressed on the former occasion, that his argument amounted to nothing at all, or his position upon this subject, simply from the very fact that the name that he offers is Jesus, and as clearly indicative of an official character and position as the name Christ. He is called Jesus, why? because he shall save his people from their sins; because of the fact that he is a Saviour, and Jesus, therefore, is as indicative of an official character as clearly as the name Christ, and, consequently, his objection to our position, amounts to simply nothing at all.

He then introduces the succession again. Well, the gentleman dies hard; he dies very hard upon that question; he hates to give it up. Having based nearly all the claim of his church in the former discussion upon the subject of succession, he now is forced through his own authorities to give it up, and to admit that it is not necessary to establish succession in order to prove the identity of the church. He is forced to admit this, by admitting what Benedict says. He dies hard. He clings to succession, however, with quite a grasp; hence, in every speech, the subject of succession must be introduced. I regard this question, so far as our discussion is concerned, as settled. I say that it is not necessary in order to establish the identity of the church. He has admitted it, and, therefore, it is out of this discussion, unless he takes back what he has said. But he introduces the word disciples again, and said that Mr. Campbell says that disciples are made by baptizing. The gentleman is just a little mistaken upon that subject. Mr. Campbell says that it embraces the instruction in regard to the rudimentary, or elementary principles of the gospel, and that this teaching in the rudimentary principles of the gospel and baptism, these together introduce the individual

into the school of Christ, where he is recognized fully and clearly as a disciple of Christ. That it is not baptism, nor is it the first teaching as presented in the commission, but that it embraces the first necessary instruction and the baptism both together."

That is the position taken by Mr. Campbell upon this subject, as may be found in his discussion with Nathan L. Rice. "But he that loves God is born of God." Well, we simply refer your minds to the statement of John, where the quotation is made, where this language is employed. John there shows what he means by the love of God. "This is the love of God, that ye keep His commandments," and that love that embraces obedience to the command of God. To such love as that we have no objection. But he inverts the order of God's commandments.

We shall not discuss this question now, but it will be discussed when we come to the proposition that my friend proposes to affirm as true; then it will be discussed fully, and, we feel confident, to the satisfaction of the gentleman, or rather to his dissatisfaction; for we are very certain that we shall be enabled to show the fallacy of his position on this subject.

But he quotes from Hebrews xi. 6, "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Well, I would ask the question, if those who believe with all their hearts that God *is*, that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek Him, if in this faith they do not embrace the plan by which we are to seek Him and enjoy His favor, and if this kind of faith is not a pretty fair faith, even from his orthodox and evangelical standpoint?

But now, with these remarks, we proceed with our argument. We had up before you the official character of the church on last evening, and we presented the evangelists,

elders and deacons. We refer your minds to a number of passages, which you may read at your leisure, namely: 1st Thessalonians v. 12; 1st Timothy v. 17; Hebrews xiii. 7-11; Acts xiv. 20-23. And then, again, in the 17th chapter, there is also a reference to the same subject; and while we have not the time to discuss at any length these official characters, we are satisfied, whatever may be the position of my friend with regard to church government, or his position with regard to our government, as he has expressed it, these official characters, he admits, are presented in the divine volume, and we state that evangelists, from the very meaning of the word itself, that their work is clearly indicated that they are to go out and bear the good news to the world, present the gospel, and gather sinners into the fold of Christ, and that elders, or bishops, are to take the oversight of those who are thus gathered in—while we understand that deacons are to attend to the secular affairs of the church.

We call your attention, seventhly, to the following argument: We argue that our proposition is true, and that we are identical with the primitive saints in the fact that we have the scriptural ordinances of the church, or we have them as delivered to the apostles and primitive saints by inspiration itself; that we are identical, therefore, with them upon this subject. First, you take the subject of baptism. We are with the primitive saints in regard to that subject—first, because we accept none as proper subjects of baptism who do not believe, and not only so believe, but who do not believe with all their hearts, and nothing short of this is that faith that we require in order to admission to the ordinance, and, consequently, every time you hear the confession taken by those of my brethren, that confession is, "Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus is the Son of God, and the only Saviour of sinners?" They are called upon then to believe with all their hearts, and this was the demand made in primi-

tive times; consequently, we say, we are identical with the primitive saints in regard to baptism, and, consequently, we are right in regard to the confession. We say, in the language of the apostles and the primitive saints, "Buried with him by baptism into death." Thus, we present baptism as a burial with the Lord; that is, the immersion of the proper subject in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. This was the practice of the primitive saints: this is our practice; consequently, we are perfectly identical with the primitive saints.

Thirdly, we are right. We are with the primitive saints in regard to the design of this institution; but we do not propose to discuss at this point the design of the institution of baptism, as this question will come up under the discussion of another proposition. But, secondly, we call your attention to the Lord's Supper. Here, again, I affirm that we occupy the scriptural ground so far as the time when this institution should be observed—namely, upon the first day of the week. But you inquire what first day of the week? I answer upon *the first day* of the week was the time when this institution was to be observed. And many of those calling themselves Baptists, acknowledge the legitimacy of our plea and of our position upon this subject, and observe upon the first day of the week the Lord's Supper, commemorating his death and his sufferings. They attend to this institution on the first day of the week, as do those of my brethren; and this, I am satisfied, my friend will not deny. But, when we come to examine 1st Corinthians and the 11th chapter, we have this reference made to the rule by which we are to be governed, the law by which we are to be controlled: "Let a man examine himself and so eat." The responsibility here is thrown upon the individual who would approach the Lord's table, "for if a man eat unworthily he eateth and drinketh condemnation to his own soul." The responsibility is placed upon the individual

that approaches the Lord's table. "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat." The primitive saints did not invite this one, and reject that one, that claimed to be a servant of the Lord Most High. They placed upon the people the responsibility of advancing to the table and partaking—Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him partake of the emblems of the shed blood and of the body of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God. Let a man examine himself and so let him eat. This is the law, then, by which we are governed, and is the law presented in the divine volume upon this subject.

But we present to your minds an argument eighthly, that we occupy the Bible ground in regard to the theory and plan of conversion. First, on the subject of faith, so far as the production of faith is concerned, we occupy the Bible ground. You then inquire, how does faith come? How is faith produced in the human heart. We answer that question by calling your attention to the positive testimony of the inspired apostles of Jesus, the Christ, in the 10th chapter of Romans, where we have in the 13th verse these words: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" Now, from these facts Paul draws a deduction: "He says faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Faith comes by hearing the Word of God. This is the deduction Paul draws from these premises. But, now, see how it agrees with the testimony of the apostle Peter, as found in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in the 7th and 8th verses of that chapter. Peter then says: "Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe;" consequently Peter affirms just what Paul affirms, that faith comes by hearing the word of the gospel, by

hearing the Word of God. I presume that Paul and Peter understood this matter perfectly. Here you have their instructions upon the subject, and you have their answer to the question, how does faith come?

I say, then, that we are right in regard to the manner by which faith comes, by which faith is produced; and we call your attention, that you may see that this is the right kind of faith, to the testimony as found in the 20th chapter of John's gospel and the 30th and 31st verses of the chapter, where we have these words: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name. We know the gentleman will not say that this faith here presented is not saving faith, that it is not justifying faith, if you please. It is that faith that looks immediately to the life that is enjoyed through Jesus Christ, our Lord. But we have in this declaration not only the manner in which faith is produced, but then we have also the subject of faith, Jesus the Christ, the Son of God. Then we have presented, and the truth affirmed, that by this faith, thus produced, we may enjoy life through the name of Jesus the Christ, that we may have life through his name. Then we are identical with the Scriptures upon this subject, and if the Scriptures are right, then we can not be wrong, for we stand precisely where they stand. We teach precisely, on this subject, what the Son of the living God in plain, explicit, and conclusive terms taught.

We call your attention to the office of faith, and in order that we may get this subject fully before your minds, we state that in the 23d verse of the 3d chapter of 1st John we have this point presented. We state that the office of faith is two-

fold in its character. First, it looks out and receives Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God. Consequently, we find in the passage, the 23d verse of the 3d chapter of John, these words: "This is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ." The first office of faith, then, is to lay hold upon the Saviour as the only Redeemer of man; and, secondly, the office of faith is internal in its character, and is exerted upon the hearts, and, consequently, we find Peter affirming, in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the chapter before referred to, in the 8th and 9th verses of the chapter—however, we read the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses together: "Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us; And put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*" [TIME EXPIRED.]

Third Evening.

ELDER RAY'S SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Your attention is invited immediately to the reply. It does appear to me that my worthy friend has left the proposition to take care of itself. He affirms *this* and the *other* concerning what is taught in the Bible, when his proposition affirms that the church organization of which himself is a member is the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. And I think it is legitimate when I ask him to draw his conclusions—not only to give us theory, but give us the facts and points of identity—not mere similarity.

In regard to what he said about the gospel being preached, and not preached before the day of Pentecost, we have the facts before us. The difficulty that he tries to urge against me would lie with equal weight against the Saviour; for he said, "The prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Now, the argument against my position is an argument against the position of Jesus Christ, and the reason I gave my opinion in regard to Matthias, is because Peter said one who *had* companied with them all the time must be elected, and when they prayed, they did not pray for God to select one, but to show them, by that means, whom he *had* chosen; and a long time before the time of the apostasy of Judas. As found in John

vi. 70, Jesus declared, "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Having reference to Judas. So I let this pass for the present.

In regard to the *name*, and the illustration that I gave, it seems he did not understand. He was basing the argument for his church identity on the name of his church, but to this moment he has not found the name "Christian Church" in the Bible, and can not find it. But, then, if he did, the fact that the denomination calls itself Christian Church would not prove that it was the Christian Church, or Church of Christ.

But, the succession: He said, "he dies hard." Well, sometimes the wish is father to the thought. I suppose that he would like for me to *die* upon some of these points, because they are in the gentleman's way, and trouble him very much. One more quotation I must give him upon the question of succession, or perpetuity of the church, as he has called my attention to it—Lard's Quarterly, for 1866, p. 309: "We think it, in some of its most material features, utterly in error. The 'rock' is not that against which the Unseen is not to prevail; neither has the church ever become extinct. These we deem gross errors." Moses Lard, one of the finest critics in the gentleman's church, a standard writer, denies his criticism in regard to "it" referring to "rock;" and then he says that the position that the church has become extinct is a *gross error*. Then my friend is in "gross error," according to the testimony of a man of the highest class of scholarship in his church; and, then, according to his own confession, if the succession stands, his church is a failure, because he knows it is of recent origin. He will not affirm that he is identified with an organization set up on the day of Pentecost. He will not affirm that. If he does, he will affirm succession.

In regard to the government of the church—*the officers*—he simply affirms but does not prove. He quotes several passages

of Scripture in regard to the church officers. He points to them and affirms, "we have the Bible officers?" I ask him for his proof. Is he to be the standard of the denomination? I am not simply debating with Dr. Lucas. He comes here, set forth to defend the claims of his church, which we deny. So I must go to the leading men, and I must examine their writings and their positions in regard to church officers and church government, church ordinances, and all these things. This is why I read from his authors; because if I was to depend on the Bible alone, as far as his church is concerned, I would never get to his church. I could never examine into its claims, because it did not begin in Bible times, I mean in apostolic times.

I deny that the Disciples have the church officers as laid down in God's Word. I do not deny the church officers as contained in the Bible, but where does he find authority for two classes of elders, different and distinct from each other—preaching elders and lay elders; ruling elders, to rule over the congregation—giving to two or three men authority to execute the discipline of the church? I ask again, where does he find that? It is not in the Scriptures, not in the Word of God; and I will give you an example of the workings of this system. Dr. L. L. Pinkerton, one of the leading Disciples in the city of Lexington, as reported in the Observer and Reporter of June, 1870, says of the elders of that church: "These men and others exactly like them, that he could name, exercise a worse than Popish tyranny over the Christian Church of this city, such as made its members almost afraid to breathe. The reformation that the two Campbells inaugurated had been terribly perverted. Instead of their blessed plan of Christian union being followed out, the breach had been made wider by uncharitableness. Instead of the number of conflicting churches being lessened, another church had been built up which had become worse than any of them, because the most

bigoted. It was the narrowest bigotry on this continent." This shows some of the fruits of that form of church government where two or three, or half a dozen men seize the reins of the government from the congregation, and instead of following the direction of Jesus Christ, "if thy brother trespass against thee," finally "tell it to the church, and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican"—I say, instead of following that direction they have departed from it.

But the Dr. tells us that they have the *Bible faith*—affirms it—and goes on to talk in regard to what is said in the Bible about faith. Let him produce any standard writer of his church on the doctrine that he contends for from the Bible. I wish to give you a quotation or two in regard to faith. Mr. Campbell says, Christian Baptist, p. 466: "Faith, then, is just the belief or persuasion that the gospel is true, which persuasion comes by hearing, perceiving or understanding what the Holy Spirit imparts or teaches concerning the Lord Jesus." Simply, then, the persuasion or conviction that the gospel is true is the faith that they contend for, or that Mr. Campbell contends for. Again, Mr. Campbell says, Christian Baptist, p. 529: "Can men, just as they are found when they hear the gospel, believe? I answer boldly, yes—just as easily as I can believe the well attested facts concerning the person and the achievements of General George Washington. I must hear the facts clearly stated and well authenticated before I am able to believe them. The man who can believe one fact well attested, can believe any other fact equally well attested." But again, Millennial Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 398, Mr. Campbell affirms: "Assistance to believe—how can a person be assisted to believe? What sort of help, and how much is wanting? Assistance to believe must be either to create in men a power which he had not before, or to repair a broken power." Thus teaching that by his own powers of mind, without the Spirit

of the living God, the man may believe to the saving of the soul. I ask you to explain how it was that the Lord *opened* Lydias' heart that she attended to the things spoken of Paul, to those things spoken in the Word of God. But here is another statement in regard to faith. Mr. Lard, in his Quarterly for 1867, p. 345, says: "That faith and belief are identical; that faith is the simple conviction that what the Bible says is true; and that the notion of various kinds of faith is false." These proofs show that this faith which they talk about, is simply a mental persuasion. They say it comes before and independent of repentance; that being so, a man hates God before repentance, and his faith then is a faith that may be exercised by wicked men; and even demons are said to believe and tremble, though they hate God.

Then, again, I wish your attention to another negative argument. *His is not the church of Christ, because it denies the appropriate work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners.* Men are recognized in the Word of God as being dead in trespass and in sins—destitute of spiritual life—hating God and hating one another. This being man's natural condition, he can no more bring himself to life, give himself spiritual life, than a dead man can raise himself up. I will not be understood as teaching that a man is physically dead in sins—that he is mentally dead—but he is destitute of holiness, destitute of righteousness, destitute of love to God, destitute of spiritual life; and these must be produced by the Spirit of the living God shedding abroad the love of God in his heart. Now, in regard to the teaching of the gentleman's church on spirit influence I wish your attention. Millennial Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 397: "All the moral power of God or of man is exhibited in the truth which they propose. Therefore, we may say that if the light or truth contain all the moral power of God, then the truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men, for we have before agreed and proved that the converting

power is moral power." Then, *the truth alone* is all that is necessary, in their system. But, says one, "I have heard them frequently say that there must be a mighty power of the Spirit of God, and there is an influence of the Spirit; and I have heard the Dr. say there is an influence of the Spirit. What influence? The Spirit of the living God influenced holy men to write the Word, but when that Word was written, they teach that all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate on the human mind *is spent,* or *exhausted.* I read you upon this subject from the testimony of Mr. Campbell, Millennial Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 295: "But to return. *As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas.* Miracles can not convert; they can only obtain a favorable hearing to the converting arguments. If they fail to obtain a favorable hearing, the arguments which they prove are as impotent as an unknown tongue. If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments, or if the New and Old Testaments contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent, and he that is not sanctified and saved by these can not be saved by angels or spirits human or divine." *That all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate on the human mind* IS SPENT, *exhausted,* in the production of the Divine Word! And when the Word operates in the arguments of the ministry of my friend's church, he calls that the operation of the Spirit! Again, Mr. Campbell has said upon this subject, Millennial Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 294: "When we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted upon minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that, that power can consist in anything else but words or arguments. Thus, in the nature of things, we are prepared to expect verbal communications

from the Spirit of God, if that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits." Verbal communication! *When* the Disciples get a communication from the Spirit of God, it is verbal! Do they get any verbal communications, and if so, how often, except what they have in the Word? and when they pray for the aid of the Spirit, do they not violate their own system?

But, I want your attention to the fact, that while denying the work of the Spirit in the conversion of men, they claim the honor of converting the human race. Upon this subject Mr. Campbell (Millennial Harbinger, new series, vol. 1, p. 271), says: "Christians must learn that the conversion of the world is the honorable employment to which the Lord has called them; and that they may have the whole honor of this great work, he has sent neither apostles, prophets, nor angels to assist them since the establishment of the church in the world." I suggest that it would be better to divide, and give the Lord Jesus Christ a part of the glory, if they are not willing to let him have it all. But I learn from God's Word, that when we have done all we can, we are to say we are unprofitable servants, "our own righteousness is as filthy rags in *his* sight;" and so a poor sinner is saved by grace, and not by his own righteousness. Then we must not claim that honor. But it is certain that they deny the work of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Campbell and those who have followed him, do so; for I can quote from their authors—representative ones—who affirm the same doctrine. Mr. C. has even gone so far as to deny satanic power, only as the power of Satan in his word. There is no power of Satan on the earth, according to Mr. Campbell; because if he had admitted that Satan had power to influence men's minds, without argument, he would have admitted that Satan had more power in this respect than God. But here is his statement upon the subject, Millennial Harbinger, vol. 5, p. 272: "The Scriptures, so far from representing *Satan* as the god and governor of the *air*,

that it constantly represents him in a *state of confinement* for his apostasy and rebellion against God, *reserved in chains under darkness, against the judgment of the great day.* So that, instead of expatiating in the boundless fields of air, and shedding his woes upon *miserable* mortals, he, and his accomplices, are described by the apostle Peter as precipitated into the Tartarian regions, bound in adamantine fetters, and to *continue* there in *custody* till the final judgment." And Mr. C. goes on to state that satanic power has been destroyed from the earth, only as it comes down by tradition. This being the case, it appears to me that they deny the plainest teachings of God's Word. Paul tells us to put on the whole armor of God, that we may be able to stand against the "wiles of the devil." You know it is said that the demons were cast out and went into the swine. They did not argue those swine into the sea. It was not done by persuasion, but it was done by their entering into the swine. Those demons were not fastened up in the Tartarian darkness. Peter represents Satan as a "roaring lion, going about seeking whom he may devour." Forty days and nights on the mountains and in the desert, Satan tempted Christ. One of the sorest trials of his life was when he met the powers of Satan and his armies; and yet, to make room for a new-fangled theory, which is false in its inception, and in consequences ruinous, Mr. Campbell has exorcised, and proposes to cast the devil out of all the dominions of God; and then Mr. Campbell says there is no such thing now as devils in the world. I have the statement here where he says that Satan enters into men *figuratively* only. I would like for my friend to answer some of my questions. I try to answer all legitimate questions that are put to me. Again, I call upon him to answer this question: "*Can any one be saved out of the church?*" I do hope he will answer. Everything will go upon the record, and people will know exactly why he don't answer.

But, the one hundred and twenty went into the Christian Church without Christian baptism! He says the apostles were *charter members.* I wonder if there is any organization in this country, or anywhere else, where charter members can come in without having been initiated. Is that the rule—that outsiders, out of an organization, can become charter members by their own, or somebody else's appointment, without initiation? No, sir. Grant they were charter members: they had their initiation; they had Christian baptism, and the organization had been set up; and the day of Pentecost others were added to them. Now, I ask the question, *Was the baptism administered by the Lord Jesus Christ, through his disciples, Christian baptism?* When the Saviour baptized through his disciples, was that Christian baptism? I would answer, even if it gave me a little trouble. Try it, anyhow. I ask, again, as he says the church became extinct, at what period? He says it was set up on the day of Pentecost—though the Bible does not say so—and that it has apostatized and became extinct. I wish to know at what time the church apostatized. I would like to know what time it began the second time, the third, or fourth time, or how many times it has apostatized; and how many times it has been set up again. These, and several other questions I would like for you to answer. I would like to know what was the condition of pardon when men became saints, when there was no church in the world. How did they come to be children of God, when there was no church? These are important questions, and, I think, ought to be answered. I would like to know how the Pedobaptists, whose hearts are purified by faith—(and that is the doctrine he preached to-night—that before repentance or baptism men have a pure heart; though he had them last night, and the night before, baptized in order to get their consciences purified or made good; but now he has quoted a passage, and has them with pure hearts before baptism)—I

wish to know whether these Pedobaptists, loving Jesus, and having a hope of heaven—not understanding immersion to mean baptism, and, therefore, neglecting it—I ask him to tell me whether they have a well grounded hope of heaven, when they die and pass into the eternal world. The doctrine of the gentleman is certainly wrong in regard to baptism—making it a condition of pardon. Men are often placed under such circumstances that they can not obey this ordinance. The Saviour has never made a plan of salvation that can not be observed under all the circumstances of human misfortune. We have a case in point. On the cross, the poor robber, thief, was dying, and he looked to the Saviour, and said, "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom;" and Jesus said, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise"—*saved!* And then again: The poor, repentant publican smote on his breast, as he stood in the temple, and said, "God, be merciful to me, a sinner," and he went down from the temple "justified," rather than the proud Pharisee. Baptism was not a condition of pardon in the case of the poor, sinful woman, recorded in Luke vii. 36-50: when she had bathed his feet with penitential tears (the feet of the Master), and wiped them with the tresses of her head, he said, "Thy faith hath saved thee: go in peace." That is the plan of salvation executed by the Son of God himself; and, further, the Saviour of all said, "The son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Before the day of Pentecost, he said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." This being the fact, he sent out the disciples to execute that grand and glorious commission.

If I have time to notice another argument, I wish to call your attention to the fact, *that the gentleman's church is not the true church, because it contains a mass of contradictions, and admits the most fearful errors into fellowship.* They have a great variety of doctrines in the church, and that is why it is so hard for people to understand precisely what they do teach.

Mr. Campbell said (Millennial Harbinger, as quoted by Dr. Jeter, p. 320): "We have had *a very large portion of this unhappy and mischievous influence to contend with.* Every sort of doctrine *has been proclaimed*, by almost all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners, and with the supposed sanction of the begun reformation." Showing that it is but a hive where the errors of almost fifteen centuries may accumulate and find a home in the gentleman's church. The reason of this is, because they have only two points upon which it is absolutely necessary for them to agree. As stated in the Christian System (and this is called by their writers the *fundamental* work), they do not exactly call it a discipline, but they look to it as a kind of directory, or guide, in their teachings; and that is where the gentleman learns about "Jesus being coronated on the day of Pentecost:" he finds it here, and he talks a good deal about it—p. 122, Mr. Campbell says: "*The belief of one fact, and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The belief of this one fact, and submission to one institution expressive of it, is all that is required of heaven to admission into the church.*" * * * "Every such person is a disciple in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution; and whether he believes the five points condemned, or the five points approved by the synod of Dort, is not so much as to be asked of him; whether he holds any of the views of Calvinists, or Arminians, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, or Quakers, is never once to be asked of such persons, in order to admission into the Christian community, called the church." Showing that the belief of one fact is sufficient; and a little further on, he says that one fact is, that Jesus is the Messiah, and that one act is immersion. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' SEVENTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My friend would have you believe that I have left the proposition. I have labored to show you that we taught certain things; that the kingdom had begun on the day of Pentecost; that the church was then established. I have presented the point that we have but one foundation, even Jesus, the Christ; but one creed, the Word of God; but one head of the church, and that we have the Bible name; that we have the Bible ordinances; that we have the Bible officers; and, then, I have shown you that these points are presented in the Word of God, and upon all of them we are identical with the primitive church. By this we have not shown a similarity, but a *positive identity*, thus far in these characteristics of the church. And, while the gentleman may think that we have left the proposition, this audience will see that we are laboring to show that we possess precisely the characteristics that were possessed by the church primitively, and are thus laboring to establish our proposition.

But, he quotes again: "The law and the prophets were until John." He says our position is opposed to the Saviour and John. Well, I am very certain it will be very hard for him to make this audience see that, just in that way. Now, if he had stated that we opposed his interpretation of these passages, then he would have told just exactly what is true, because we certainly do oppose his interpretation of these passages. Now, we quoted "the law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of God is preached." But,

the question arises, how is it preached? as actually existing, or is it preached as at hand? and as approaching?

"*Enggidzo,*" as we have shown from a number of authorities, means to draw near, and we have quoted a number of passages in the Word of God to show this is the manner that the word is used in the divine Scriptures, as approaching, or drawing near. Now, we say it was preached in that way, and the Word of God thus presents the matter. Thus his interpretation of these passages we oppose—but not the passages themselves, not the passage when legitimately and properly interpreted, or presented. We say that the kingdom of God was preached as at hand, or as drawing near, or as approaching, since the days of John, and he has not relieved himself of the difficulty.

But the apostles were not called until John was in prison, and Jesus did not give to them the kingdom until after he went away, and John preached the kingdom at hand before he was in prison. Now, then, I would like to know how John preached the kingdom of God as at hand, or as visibly existing, according to his interpretation, before ever he was in prison—a long time before he was in prison, and yet the apostles were not called until after he was in prison, and they did not receive the kingdom till Jesus ascended to the Father, and, of course, it did not actually exist. I would like the gentleman to tell us how John could preach it as actually existing before Jesus became the foundation, according to the gentleman's showing upon which the church or kingdom is made to rest. That is, according to the gentleman's position, the kingdom of God existed, and the church was built before it had a foundation. Now, we do oppose that interpretation of these Scriptures, and we expect to oppose them until the end, because we regard them as a perversion. The gentleman, as a matter of course, is sincere in what he has presented upon the subject, yet we regard this interpretation as standing in

direct opposition to the truth of the Word of God, as presented in the Scriptures of inspiration.

But the *name* Christian. We have presented an argument here from certain passages, and we have founded an argument upon an examination of certain terms, and we have shown that this name is by divine appointment. Has he entered into an investigation of the argument founded upon these terms presented? Has he shown that they were false? He has not! He will not! He knows he can not; therefore he will not! He has never once entered upon the investigation of these terms in all the discussions we have held, or labored to show by the investigation of the terms themselves, that our interpretation of them is false. Not once has he ever done it. We feel very confident that he will not.

But succession again! Well, we will have to give the gentleman a little more on that question. We quoted from Benedict and Robinson the other night. He said that he indorsed Robinson; still, he hangs on, notwithstanding his admission, as though he was determined not to give it up. Now, we will give him a little more Baptist authority on that question. We call your attention to the testimony as found in the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, p. 796, and this is Baptist authority. Now, then, what do we find? "We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community—" Here, then, you discover he is speaking with regard to the Baptist Church —a Baptist speaking. He says it has stood since the days of the apostles, and which has preserved the pure doctrines of the gospel through all ages. This is what he affirms here, and what my friend affirms. But now notice on further: "The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the

Baptist denomination, tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary; and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient." This is the testimony of Dermont. Here, then, we have quoted this simply to show you that we are willing to get before your minds all that they say. Now, this is his testimony, he says from the highest authority; but this is not the passage we wanted to quote and get before your minds, for he goes on then to describe the Mennonites. We will give you just exactly what is said upon this question. I believe somebody has turned my leaves, or I have done it myself. But again we call your attention to page 1149, where the author is discussing this subject of succession. He says: "For, after all, an uninterrupted succession, however gratifying it may be to be able to trace it, is necessary only to the church which regulates its practice by tradition, and not by the pure Word of God." Now, this is the testimony of this Baptist upon these subjects: that it is not necessary to trace it, only by such as propose to found their church upon tradition, and not upon the Word of God.

Now, then, we call your attention to the passage that we thought we had open when we first opened the book, on page 188. This is further Baptist testimony upon the subject of succession: "Innumerable volumes have been written under the title of Church History; but, after all, we know but very little of the real church of Christ for many hundred years. We have very ample accounts of the Anti-christian church, that false pretender, in unhallowed alliance *with the kings of the earth*, and *drunken with the blood of the saints;* but the history of the uncorrupted church, which maintained the word, worship, and the ordinances of Christ, while *all the world was wondering after the beast*, is enveloped in the ob-

security of that retreat which God *prepared her in the wilderness.*" Now, here he says we have no reliable, authentic history of the true church for hundreds of years. And here Robinson says, and so does Benedict, that we have no history of the succession of the church, and have not facts sufficient to construct a doctrine of the succession of the church of God. He affirms, and all those others affirm, that it is not necessary; only to that individual that would labor to found his claim, or that church that would labor to found its claim upon tradition, and not upon the Word of God.

But now, with regard again to Matthew xvi. 18, he says, or quotes Mr. Lard. Well, we stated that we believed that the antecedent of the pronoun there is "rock." We stated further, that we believed and that we knew that to be true, that either church or rock might stand as the antecedent of the pronoun "it," and we simply determine the question by other passages. Thus, we state, and the gentleman has not denied it, and he will not deny it, that either church or rock might grammatically stand and be represented by the pronoun "it;" the pronoun "it" standing for either the one or the other. He has not denied this. I know he will not deny it; and so far as our introduction of this passage into the controversy is concerned, it makes no difference whether you adopt the one or the other, for our argument is founded upon the declaration, "Upon this rock *will* I build my church." We have introduced this passage to show that the beginning of the church was future, and that is all that we introduced the passage to prove.

But he says, "The gentleman (referring to me) does not affirm that his church is the church established on the day of Pentecost, or identical with it." That is just precisely what I do affirm, that the church with which I stand identified possesses the characteristics that the church established on the day of Pentecost possessed, and as that was the church of

Christ, the church with which I stand identified is the church of Christ—the visible church of Christ. Certain characteristics anciently were equal to the church of Christ, and these to-day are equal to nothing less than they were then, and are equal to the church of Christ now.

But, the elders. He wants to know where there is any authority for the distinction between ruling elders and those who teach. Well, we will just call your attention to a passage, for the gentleman's accommodation. In the 5th chapter of 1st Timothy, 17th verse: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." Now, there is a distinction made by Paul—"especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."

But he says we are not the church. Why? Because we deny the work of the Holy Spirit. We say that this is not a fair presentation of the case. We affirm that the Spirit does operate; that it operates through the truth. This is our proposition. We deny the interpretations of many of his brethren, when they affirm that the Spirit operates miraculously, independently, or above and beyond the truth. When he affirms this, we deny his interpretation; we deny that view of the matter; but we do not deny the view as presented in the Word of God, but affirm it and maintain it.

But the Pedobaptists! Are they saved? Suppose I say they are not, or suppose I say they are. I ask, how does that effect the proposition now before us? Just in no way at all. But the gentleman would labor to get this point, and that point, and the other point before your minds into the investigation, that has no connection whatever, and it would seem to look as though the gentleman was laboring for a little sympathy upon this question; that he would like to have a little sympathy from his Pedobaptist friends, while he calls them children of God, and when the question of the Lord's table is

before us. He says to them, "You are God's children, but you can not come here and eat with me at the Lord's table. I will examine you, and tell you to stay away." But he wants a little sympathy from that quarter, and I trust he may have it, if you can have it in your minds to give it to him. He endeavored to draw it out on the Southern Confederacy, and now he wants to draw it out among the Pedobaptists; and all I have to say is, "Give him all the sympathy you can," for the Lord knows he needs all he can get. Let him have it. But he wants to know about the thief on the cross—"How was it with that individual?" and so on. What will become of such as can not obey the gospel? I submit this proposition: that ability is the measure of responsibility, and that a man is responsible just so far as he may have ability and opportunity to obey God, and no farther. So far as the thief upon the cross, so far as the publican and the woman, to which he refers, are concerned, I state that all these passages were before the day of Pentecost, and consequently come not into this investigation. While the Lord was here personally he had the right, and it was his prerogative to do as he pleased, and say what he pleased to the people that stood before him; and then when he gave a law and commission by which the apostles were to be controlled, and told them to tarry in Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high to be prepared to carry out that commission. Since that commission has been given, and the apostles have been qualified to carry it out, we are bound by that commission; not by anything that antedates it as a law of pardon, but by the law as embodied in the commission itself. The commission embodies and embraces the law of pardon by which we are now to be governed, and by which we are now to be controlled.

But, "all sorts of doctrine—all sorts of doctrine." Well, the gentleman lives in a glass house upon this subject, and he certainly ought not to throw stones, for there is just as great

danger of his establishment being broken in as anybody else's. You can take the Calvinistic Baptists, that say God from all eternity elected a part of mankind without foresight, and cursed the other part. That is one view. Now, take the Baptists, again, and they say that the offers of pardon are unto all men; and this they affirm; and then, again, you find that Jeter affirms that faith is the beginning of spiritual life; repentance is a part of spiritual life, and, according to this idea, is the beginning of repentance, and yet my friend has repentance first. Lynd says: "He that believes truly will repent;" but my friend says he can not believe at all until he has repented; and here you have a contradiction among Baptists. And old Brother Hume says a man is pardoned before repentance and faith and everything else; and here, again, is some of the doctrine of the Baptist Church. And then, again, I read from Baptistos, a letter that has been published by a Baptist preacher, as republished in the "Cincinnati Standard;" and what does he say? "As regards ourselves, we immerse all applicants who confess their faith in the Christ, the divine Son of God, for the remission of sins. We believe nothing merely because it is in the Baptist creed, and to be found in the writings of uninspired men. We have churches which partake ordinarily of the Lord's Supper every Lord's day, and churches which have never had any written creed. The Baptist Church would not reject an applicant for membership who confesses faith in Christ, unless having good reasons to doubt his sincerity." Now, here are Baptistos' views also upon that subject, and we might go on and give you a list almost as long as you might desire, showing that all sorts of doctrine are preached by Baptists also. Consequently, the gentleman should touch a question of this kind very lightly.

But, to advance with our argument, we stated at the close of our address, that the office of faith was first to receive

Jesus, the Son of God; secondly, to purify the heart—an internal work. Well, now the heart is purified, and the love of sin in the heart is destroyed, because the heart being purified by faith, and the love of sin being removed, it can not exist in the heart; the love of holiness is created in its stead, and as it was the natural consequence for a man that loves sin, to practice sin, so now it is the natural consequence for a man that loves holiness, to practice holiness. The heart is purified by faith, and the love of holiness is created in that heart by virtue of the office of faith upon the heart, and a godly sorrow for sin is excited in the heart by virtue of the office of faith upon the heart, and now, says Paul, this godly sorrow works repentance—it is not repentance itself.

The gentleman would have you believe that this is repentance itself, but says Paul, in the 7th chapter of the 2d Corinthians and 10th verse: "For godly sorrow"—that is, the result of the office of faith upon the human heart—"worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of:" There can not be any gospel repentance without godly sorrow. The godly sorrow must exist before repentance, for this repentance unto salvation is worked by the godly sorrow that exists in the heart by virtue of the purifying influence and power of faith upon the heart. Then we say that we are identical with the original church, with regard to the office of faith. We remark, then, thirdly, that we are identical with the primitive saints, in regard to the connection that exists between faith and obedience to God. We say that faith without works of obedience to God is dead, as the body without the spirit is dead. Faith without works is dead also, being alone. This is the language of James, the apostle, and so we affirm, and we affirm in strict accordance with the language of Paul, as found in Romans vi. 17, 18: "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made

free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness, and have you fruit unto holiness, and in the end everlasting life." That when they obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, that they were made free from sin and became the servants of righteousness. The forty-seven translators of the king have translated this little particle "de" by the word "then," and you may translate it then, or therefore, and the idea is precisely the same; they were made free from sin when they obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered unto them, and not only made free from sin, but became the servants of righteousness. And this is in strict accordance with the great commission given to the apostles, when Christ says: "Go preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Here you have this connection between faith and obedience to God, and not only here, but then you have in the commission, as recorded by Luke xxiv. 46, 47: "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Here, then, this repentance in connection with faith of the gospel, this obedience to God, is enjoined in order to salvation. My friend's interpretation of the commission, as given by Mark, seems to be this: He that believeth and is saved, shall be baptized, for he denies that obedience, in connection with faith, has anything to do with the justification of the sinner; and he says, with Mr. Jeter, that the very moment, the very instant that the man believes he passes from the state of condemnation to justification, he passes out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light, becomes a child of God, and is accepted of the Father. Hence, we say that with this position he must take the position that he that believeth and is saved, shall be baptized; while Jesus says, that he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved. But, you notice here,

the illustration as given by James, the body without the spirit is dead. You see the ghastly skeleton in all its frightful character, fit representative and emblem of the land of death. All the life and beauty of that organism has passed away; the sparkle of the eye has grown dim in death; the step has faltered, and the beauty of that form has faded, and is no more. I ask you "what is it?" "Well," says James, "that is faith, without obedience; that is faith alone." But here in the perfect form as it came from the hand of the Eternal Father, when the first pair were placed in the garden of delights, that garden of flowers and beauty beheld that perfect form; the sparkling eye, the rosy cheek and symmetry of form; behold it there in all its completeness, in all its beauty, and what is that? Says James, "that is faith and obedience; that is faith made perfect by obedience to God," while, in this other case, without obedience faith is dead, and is as the body without the spirit. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S SEVENTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: I proceed to call your attention to the remarks of my worthy friend, but before I do, I wish to call your attention to the testimony that I desired to read in the former speech, on page 175 of Mr. Lard's Quarterly, for 1866—a foot note in regard to Mr. Campbell's views on demonology: "The devil is never said to enter into any one unless in some figurative way, as in the case of Judas" (Campbell's lecture, quoted), showing that the erroneous views of Mr. Campbell concerning Spirit influence caused him to reject the Bible doctrine of satanic power and satanic influence. But my friend took care not to answer the argument drawn from his own authors. He does not contradict, nor call in question the quotations. I wish you to remember the correctness of these quotations, as read from his authors. The doctrines contained in them show the fearful errors into which *his* church has fallen. He thinks that there would be some palliation, however, if he could find errors among the Baptists. But we are not discussing Baptist claims just now. He would like to get off of the subject on to something else, as he finds this very hard work. But, we will attend to that when we come to it, please, Dr. Lucas.

But, the Dr. says, in regard to the Lord's Supper, "the time of its observance"—and he emphasizes it very forcibly—"is the first day of the week." I call upon him for divine authority to show that that ordinance should be observed *every* first day

of the week any more than every day of the week. Let him give us the chapter and verse.

But he gets up and tells the people I am pleading for the Pedobaptists' sympathy. I do not know that I am doing so. I wish to press the gentleman to take a position in regard to the different plans of salvation he has advocated; and if he confesses that men may be saved without baptism, then, according to his position, they may be saved without remission of sins, without the new birth, and without regeneration! If the Pedobaptists are saved, I wish to know by what plan he is going to save them, and then we will have all his plans. But he must appeal for sympathy to Baptist *communion*. Well, we have not come to that yet. You can just hold up. You have enough to do, it seems to me, with the present proposition, if you will attend to your work closely. I will read you in regard to the communion from Mr. Campbell, the father and founder of his church, vol. 2, Millennial Harbinger, p. 393: "We do not recollect that we have ever argued out the merits of this 'free and open communion system.' But one remark we must offer in passing, that we must regard it as one of the weakest and most vulnerable causes ever plead; and that the 'great' Mr. Hall, as he is called, has, in his defense of the practice, made it appear worse than before. In attempting to make it reasonable, he has only proved how unreasonable and unscriptural it is." And yet the gentleman's church practices that that Mr. Campbell declares to be "unscriptural" and "*unreasonable*." And Mr. Lard affirms that it is wrong—that it is doing injustice to the cause of truth, and injustice to the community. And yet my friend advocates a communion with those that he will not admit before this enlightened congregation to be children of God. He wants to commune with those not immersed, not baptized, and it is very hard to tell just exactly which side of the line he stands. They will admit that, perhaps, there are children of God among the Pedobaptists, but when

pressed very hard they say, "Well, there is no salvation without baptism!" I wish to develop the gentleman in regard to his *plans* of salvation. If baptism is a condition of pardon, I wish to know if Pedobaptists will get to heaven, dying in that situation? I ask these questions in all candor, and I think this enlightened community *will demand that you answer my questions.* You ask me questions of this sort, and I will answer to the best of my ability, whether I fail or not. You ask a fair question, and I will try to answer it.

But he refers you to the Southern Confederacy. I do not think—in fact, I know I did not say I was a member of the Southern Confederacy. I lived under that government for a while, but I was not connected with the government as such.

In regard to the question of *succession* he seems very much troubled, and he undertook to read a quotation against it, as he supposed. He began with a passage that was suitable to read, but instead of it being the testimony of a Baptist, it is the testimony of learned Pedobaptists. And he read to where it said the Baptists had stood from the time of Christ until now, but, then, he found that would not do, and he stopped reading. Well, I sympathize with him a little just there, because I may miss my pages and get into trouble too. But, then, he read from p. 188, Religious Encyclopedia: "Innumerable volumes," says the author, "have been written under the title of Church History, but, after all, we know but very little of the real church of Christ for many hundred years. We have very ample accounts of the Anti-christian church, that false pretender, in unhallowed alliance *with the kings of the earth*, and *drunken with the blood of the saints;* but the history of the uncorrupted church, which maintained the word, worship, and ordinances of Christ, while *all the world was wondering after the beast*, is enveloped in the obscurity of that retreat which *God prepared for her in the wilderness.*" Showing that this writer holds that while the history of the real church of Christ had

not been written as the history of anti-christ had, yet that church was preserved. And the gentleman's proof shows the doctrine of the succession of the church in the wilderness. So he has made no headway against the testimony that we have brought to bear upon this subject.

But, the right name. He asks me to enter the discussion of the name. Whenever he finds the name "Christian Church" used as a denominational name in the Bible, I will discuss it. I do not object to the name *Christian*, and never have, as applied to God's children, but not as a church hobby, not as an exclusively denominational name: it is not so found in God's Word, and he ought to know it by this time. When he finds it used in that manner, I will yield this point. I wish him to tell me in what chapter and verse of the Bible he finds the word *Christian* applied to the church. I call your attention to the testimony of Alexander Campbell (Millennial Harbinger, new series, vol. 4, p. 24) on the name Christian: "Have we any divine authority for being called Christians at all? The same question may be variously propounded; as, for example, was the name Christian first given by heaven or earth, by God or man? Or, was it recommended by human authority, and finally adopted by divine authority?" "We may fearlessly affirm, from all that has recently been written on the subject, and from all that is in the New Testament, that no person can possibly prove that it was divinely introduced or sanctioned." And yet he is trying to prove it. Again: "If the name Christian had been given at Antioch, twenty years before, by divine command, what an ungodly man must Luke have been during these *twenty-one years* after, and fourteen years before —in all, thirty-five years—never to have called them Christians, but, on the contrary, waywardly and frowardly to have called them *disciples* all the while." "Unless, then, we suppose this man Luke to have been a bold and daring offender against a divine revelation, it is infallibly certain that he and

his companions, the apostles, did not receive the name. Christian as coming from heaven, but from the rude and profane Antiochians." Thus, the *father* of *his* church testifies, with all the force of his logic, *that the name Christian did not come from God, from heaven; that it was not even divinely sanctioned, but was derived from the rude and profane Antiochians.* I think it is time to let that pass.

But he tells us he has authority for two classes of elders. You have not given us the proof yet, in my humble judgment. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those that labor in word and doctrine." Now, if he will examine the meaning of the word *Kopiōntes*, he will find that it means *to labor exhaustively*, or *to be weary, tired, faint, to labor* to exhaustion. There is a difference between the labors of those who are elders. Some toil their lives away, toil to exhaustion, until weary and faint; and others are elders that labor comparatively little. There is only one office found and described in the New Testament as applicable to elders. If there are two different orders of elderships, where are the two offices described in the Word of God? The gentleman can not find it to save his life—the position they occupy, ruling over the church of God, in the transaction of the church business. He will find set forth, if he will examine carefully, in the Word of God, that the *ruling* of elders is to be by example unto the church of God, and by wholesome doctrine—not by taking the transaction of the business of the church out of the hands of the church. When my friend studies the subject he will find this to be the fact. Thus, it is shown that he is wrong, mistaken, in regard to the officers of his church.

Again, he refers to Matthew xvi. 18. He is troubled about that now. "We did not quote it in order to prove the succession, but to show that the building of the church was future!" Well, it appears the passage has two edges to it; and while it

does not militate against our position concerning the setting up of the church, or building up increasingly, it shows that the church is not to be prevailed against by the gates of hell. And I have piled upon him the testimony of Campbell, Lard and Lipscomb, and Franklin—all the weight of learning and power in the gentleman's denomination, showing that the church of the living God has stood until now; and, if I understand him, he says, if it has stood, and the succession is true, then he surrenders his cause.

He has certainly failed, and certainly will fail, because he has to prove, not simply that they have points of similarity, but that they are identical. And if the original church has ceased to exist, then there is no church of Christ on earth, and can not be, because the one set up by uninspired men—I care not how many points of similarity it may have—can not be the church of Christ. It must have the organization and perpetuity. While Baptist authors say that it is not necessary to our claims that we be able to trace the succession, yet we claim there must be a succession. The church has continued, whether we are able to trace it or not. But when we find a church set up by men lately, we know *that* is not in the succession, not the true church.

The Dr. appeals for sympathy in regard to the Lord's table. The Disciples hold open communion with those they do not recognize as God's children, but *they* talk about Baptist close communion!

But we come to another statement. *Ability*, he says, *is the measure of responsibility*. I suppose that he applies that to men. I believe that God holds the devil responsible, yet he is unable to turn and live. The Saviour commanded him "to serve the Lord thy God," and that "Him only shalt thou serve;" and yet Satan could not do so. There are men who commit the unpardonable sin, and it is just as impossible for them ever to become Christians as it is for Satan. According

to the gentleman's rule, when they have committed the unpardonable sin, then they are not responsible for any outrage they may commit! Then, again, the heathen and those not in heathen lands, not having heard the gospel, not having a minister to baptize them, and as baptism is a condition of pardon, as he was trying to argue just now, then they are saved on the ground of irresponsibility, because they have not the ability to be baptized! Then all the heathen are saved without the gospel, and without baptism, according to the gentleman's rule!! If so, it is a great misfortune to send the gospel to the heathen. I wonder he don't quit making rules when he gets into such trouble with his rules.

But the examples I referred to—the pardon of the poor woman and the publican. He says that all these were before the day of Pentecost; yet, he has told this people that the Disciples accept Christ, while they reject the Bible plan of salvation executed by the Son of God himself. He takes the Bible himself, but when I press him with the Bible truth of the living God, he cries out: "Oh, that was before the day of Pentecost, way back yonder;" like a last year's almanac, it is out of date just now.

I proceed with my argument. I was introducing proof to show that his is not the church of the living God, *because it furnishes a congenial home for a vast multitude of heresies—soul-destroying and blighting heresies.* I wish to call your attention to Millennial Harbinger, new series, vol. 1, p. 510. It seems there was one Dr. Thomas, of Virginia, a brother *reformer* of Mr. Campbell's, who got to advocating a set of doctrines of this sort—and I will read some points of doctrine advocated by him. He says: "All infants, idiots and heathens will sleep through endless duration—they can never rise." He was a non-resurrectionist, it seems. Again: "All Methodists, Old Side Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and sinners, will be raised to the damnation of annihilation." That is a pretty

hard sentence, it seems to me. "Eternal life or existence conditional, the condition being faith in the resurrection of Christ from the dead, reformation and baptism." "Man has no soul nor existence separate, distinct, and independently of the body." "That the Spirit of God does not operate on any person apart from the word written." "It is sinful for an *unconverted person* to pray to God." Dr. Thomas held these abominable errors, yet he professed to believe the *one fact*, that Jesus is the Messiah, and to submit to the *one act*. No man could turn him out of the church. According to Mr. Campbell's law or rule, he had a right there. Notwithstanding the Disciples sometimes will discuss these questions with Universalists, and contend that it is a terrible heresy, yet, if a Universalist will come inside of their church no questions will be asked, but as long as he is outside they will fight him to the last. I would like to know whether the gentleman is disposed to call in question these statements. I say, then, that the gentleman's church is full of contradictions. Mr. Campbell says that all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate on the human mind is spent, as already quoted. Again, he says in regard to faith: "Saving faith is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit, and that no man can believe to the saving of the soul, but by the Holy Spirit."—[Chris. Bap., p. 353.] Denying the power of the Holy Spirit to operate upon the human heart, as it has been exhausted, then again declaring that saving faith is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit. Contradiction after contradiction is found in the system.

As the gentleman quotes so largely from Dr. Jeter, in regard to the reformation, I would like to turn to a statement from the Dr., p. 365: "It would not be difficult from the writings of Mr. Campbell, to draw up a creed, which in all essential points would be acceptable to evangelical Christendom. In this chiefly lies the danger of Campbellism. Thousands of persons have been seduced into the belief that the

Reformers differ nothing from the Baptists, except in weekly communion, and other unimportant points. But the reader has seen that Campbellism has two sides—an orthodox and a heterodox—an evangelical, and, for lack of a better term, it must be said, a reformed side." So, then, they hold out the orthodox side when it suits them, and say we are almost the very same as "Baptists." I have heard some of the Disciples, since I come into this community, say "there is no difference scarcely!" Yet, they deny that the Baptists belong to the church of Christ. Sometimes they complain because we wont commune with them. They want to commune with Babylon, as they call us. They are hungry almost to commune with those whom they regard as in Babylon! Mr. Jeter said, in regard to the time when they were excluded from the Baptist fellowship, p. 88: "What was to be done in this crisis? The Reformers, with Mr. Campbell at their head, were violently opposed to separation from the Baptists, and were ready, to a man, to fight for peace. It can hardly be doubted that this desire of union sprang from policy, rather than love. They were willing to remain for a time in Babylon, that they might extricate others from its smoke, vassalage, and degradation. Knowing themselves to be in a hopeless minority, they were desirous to be permitted to avail themselves of Baptist pulpits and presses, for the propagation of their principles. But a division was inevitable. It existed in fact—a division in sentiment, affection, interest, and aim—and it only remained to be carried out in form. Had the churches a *right* to expel the Reformers? The power of expelling factions and disorderly members seems to be indispensable to the purity, peace, and prosperity of the churches, and this power is distinctly conferred by the Scriptures," showing that for these errors they were excluded. They will hold out the orthodox side of the reformation, and say "we believe that the Holy Spirit operates," but when you come to ferret them out, they mean

the Holy Spirit operated in dictating God's Word, and when the Word was finished, the Holy Spirit retired from the work. That is the teaching of Mr. Campbell and of Mr. Lard—and it is the teaching of others—some few of them sometimes will say "that in the hearts of *Christians* there is a direct operation of the Spirit of God." I do wish the Dr. would tell us whether he believes in the direct operation of the Spirit of God in the hearts of Christians—an immediate operation. I ask that question. He may tell me he believes it, but I would like for him to tell it publicly. Sing it out, if you please, my dear friend. Again, Mr. Jeter's (Campbellism Examined, p. 93): "This unhappy state of things has evidently been produced by the preaching and writings of Alexander Campbell, and his adherents. After having deliberately and prayerfully examined the doctrines held and propagated by them, and waited long to witness their practical influence on the churches, and upon society in general, we are thoroughly convinced that they are doctrines not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ—disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency; and, therefore, ought to be disavowed and resisted by all the lovers of truth and sound piety." Page 95: "While they arrogate to themselves the title of 'Reformers,' it is lamentably evident that no sect in Christendom needs reformation more than they do." This is the testimony of the ablest men that ever lived upon Virginia's soil. These ancient men of God had examined the fruits of that system, wherein all sorts of doctrine was preached by nearly all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners and with the supposed sanction of the reformation.

Millennial Harbinger, new series, vol. 3, p. 338, Mr. Campbell says: "When we drew up our prospectus for our first publication, we headed it the 'The Christian,' and had it not been that we found ourselves anticipated, we should have adhered to the title. I hesitated between the title 'Baptist

Christian' and 'Christian Baptist,' and, on suggesting my embarrassment to a friend, who has since given himself due credit for the hint as an original idea, he thought the latter [Christian Baptist] was a better passport to favor than either of the others. We never fully approved, but from expediency adopted it. Finding that our brethren were being called 'Christian Baptists,' we changed the title of our work when we enlarged it, designing it only to be the harbinger of better times;" showing that he adopted the name *Baptist* in connection with his paper, from *expediency*—not because he *approved* it, but as *a passport to favor*, because he desired success among Baptists—because he desired fellowship among them! [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' EIGHTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My friend is determined to hold on to the old question of succession. He goes back to it again. Now, then, we quoted and we based our position right upon this language, as we stated in the beginning—and my friend has admitted it—Benedict, page 51, on the succession of the church: "I shall not attempt to trace a continuous line of churches, as we can for the few centuries past in Europe and America. That is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim, and, of course, we make no effort to prove it. We place no kind of reliance upon this sort of testimony to establish the soundness of our faith, or the validity of our administration, and so we affirm;" and then he goes on further: "The more I study the subject, the stronger are my convictions, that if all the facts in the case could be disclosed, a very good succession might be made out." If all the facts could be disclosed—if we only had the evidence, we could prove succession beyond all doubt, but not having the evidence, of course we can not do it. Just like many other things where the little "*if*" steps in.

And now I am going to call your attention to the testimony of Benedict and Robinson. They are leading writers in the Baptist Church—Robinson says, and Benedict indorses the statement—pages 34, 35: "The Protestants, by the most substantial arguments, have blasted the doctrine of Papal succession; and yet these very Protestants have undertaken to make proof of an unbroken series of persons of their own sen-

friend is pretty nearly in the same difficulty—even granted that it is so. Here are those that teach this heresy, called Campbellism, and he fights it now and calls us, if not in so many words, a ——— set of hypocrites, acting not from principle, but from policy and dishonesty, and in regard to whom the gentleman says: "I will fight and talk about you in that way as long as you are outside, but if you will come and join the Baptists, we will take you without baptizing, and without changing your principles at all. That is all right if you will join the Baptists, and come in the Baptist Church. "That is all right, but we will fight you as long as we can if you don't join the Baptist Church." Now, we have a case of that very kind right here. It is well enough for the gentleman to inquire in regard to his surroundings, before he goes so far from home.

Now, we wish to call your attention to some of the points that have been presented; and I ask you, did the gentleman notice what we presented? We called your attention to the manner in which faith was produced and created in the heart; we called your attention to the positive declaration of the Word of God, where it is affirmed that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God; we called your attention to the declaration that "these signs are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." Has the gentleman noticed our arguments, even on these subjects, wherein we showed our perfect identity, on this subject, with the primitive church—not like it, but perfectly identical with the primitive church? We have shown you that by faith the heart is purified, and that as the result that godly sorrow is wrought in the heart, and that this godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation; not that it is repentance itself, but it "*works* repentance unto salvation that needeth not to be repented of." And we have shown a connection here

between faith and repentance, and we have shown that this faith and this repentance is necessary in order to the remission of sins, and that one is but the result of the office of the other on the heart as exhibited in the life. Has he shown that we are wrong on that subject? We have appealed to the Word of God to show that we are not *similar* to the primitive saints, on this question, but that we are *perfectly identical*, that we stand on the same ground precisely. Have you heard him notice our arguments upon these *points?* upon these subjects? No. Thus far he has been as silent as the night of the grave. But what has he done? Why, he has called your attention again to Campbell and Lard. He has quoted from all those authorities. Now, I will just state again, that if you will take from him Campbell and Lard, and one or two other works from which he has quoted, he would not have a thing to say. He would then, as we sometimes say out in this western country, be entirely destitute of ammunition. He would have nothing at all to say; and, as before stated, in the prospective book that is to result from this discussion, if you will just take away from him what he submits, what he has quoted from Campbell and Lard, and one or two others, it would not be right to call it a Ray and Lucas discussion, sure as you live, for Brother Ray would not have much in it. He would not have much in the book. He would have but a very small part. His part is a very small portion, and in order to make up his time, and to make a reasonable portion of the book, he must call on Campbell and Lard, and a few others. Well, I knew that is just precisely what he would do, because I have seen him go over the course before; and I knew very well that he had no other kind of material to occupy his time and interest the audience. But we have presented arguments, and he has failed to notice them; and this audience will bear testimony to the fact that he has noticed but very few arguments that we have submitted, and upon which we especially rely

for the establishment of the truth of the proposition we affirm. We started out with certain Scriptures, in order to show that the beginning of the kingdom of God was on the first Pentecost after the ascension of the Saviour, and that this was the teaching of the Word of God upon the subject; that we are identical with the Word of God upon this question—this being our teaching—the Word of God—no more, and no less. We have presented these points; we have called your attento the various passages of the Scriptures—to a great number of Scriptures, in order to establish the truth of our proposition. And what has *he* done? Well, he has said the law and the prophets were until John: since then the kingdom of God is preached. He has quoted that passage. He has quoted one or two other passages of a kindred nature and character, but has he labored to show that these passages, to which we have referred, can be reconciled with his interpretation of those passages? I ask you, have you heard his effort at reconciliation upon these passages? I feel confident that you will bear me testimony that that effort has not been made. But we have labored to show you that all those passages quoted by the gentleman may be explained and reconciled fully with those that we have quoted, looking to the futurity of the establishment of the kingdom of Christ, and we have given you a rule by which to examine those passages; that is, we have given you a rule by which we may settle this question; and that rule is this: *That in the Scriptures of God that things that are future are very frequently spoken of as present, or as past; that things present or past are never spoken of as future.* We have submitted this rule. We have challenged him to show its fallacy. We have challenged him to show that the rule is not in strict accordance with fact, and that it is not a safe and reliable rule of interpretation. Has he presented a single case in the Word of God to show that this rule affirms falsely? If he will show a single case in the Word of God where this rule af-

firms falsely, then we say to you, that we will frankly acknowledge our error upon the question; but he has not in the two preceding debates. He has not now; and yet this rule has been before him all the time; and he will not—and why? Because he can not. He can not show that this rule affirms falsely. We have presented various arguments, and have submitted them in various forms. Has he shown you that they were false? In regard to the foundation, has he shown you that we were wrong? In regard to the creed, has he shown you that we were wrong? The truth, the Scriptures inspired of God, we claim as the only creed; we presented to the gentleman this fact, that the Scriptures inspired of God constitute our rule; that they furnish the doctrine; that they furnish the reproof; that they furnish the instruction in righteousness, the correction and instruction in righteousness, so that the men of God may be truly furnished unto all good works; may be perfectly and thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Has he shown you that we have affirmed falsely in regard to this matter? Has he shown you that this is not true with reference to those of my brethren, with those with whom I stand identified? Has he shown you that this was not the primitive doctrine and position of the church? Has he shown that we are not identical with the primitive saints upon this question? He has not. He has not shown it; and so with regard to the head of the church; and so with regard to every point that we have here presented. And when we come down to the last point discussed, the subject of faith, the subject of repentance, and the connection of obedience with faith, has he shown you that our position is false? Has he taken the argument furnished from James out of our hands? He has not. He does not even try to do it. He does not even mention the passage. He can talk a great deal better about something that Alexander Campbell has said, and that he has opposed in his little book. He can talk a great deal

better about that than he can talk about what James has affirmed, or the apostle Peter has presented, or Paul has declared. He has not even referred to the passage but when we presented the argument in favor of our position, the connection of faith and obedience, as presented in the commission, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Has he referred to it? Did he mention it at all? Did he, I ask you, show you that our argument was false upon that question? You all know that he did not. He did not even mention it. But he began to read from Campbell again, and from Lard, and from somebody else. He never even mentioned the point of the difficulty that we presented. But, from his standpoint, the passage should read, "He that believeth *and is saved* shall be baptized," while the apostle says, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*"

In connection with these passages, we call your attention to some others. Notice the language as found in John iii. 5. In the 3d verse Jesus tells Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he can not see"—he can not discern or enjoy—"the kingdom of God." Nicodemus inquires, how can this be? In the 5th verse Jesus answers that question: "Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Here, then, we have the Saviour affirming that it is necessary that the individual shall be born of water, as well as of the Spirit; that he must submit to the institution of baptism, in connection with the Spirit's influence, in order to enter into the kingdom of God—for all, or nearly all, with very few exceptions, agree that our Saviour refers to Christian baptism; and we have not only this passage showing that it is necessary that the individual be baptized, as well as come under the influence of the Spirit, or brought under the influence of the Word of God, in order to enter into the kingdom of God. Not only these passages show that in the plan of conversion baptism is found in connection with faith

and repentance, but also the language found in the case of Saul of Tarsus is in point. In this history we have his conversion reported. Ananias appears to him and says: "Brother Saul, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." So we have it affirmed in Acts xxii. We find that many of the gentleman's authorities teach precisely what we affirm upon this subject; and right here, Baptistos, a passage that we quoted among other authorities, and that we shall quote before we shall have disposed of this question—right here, this authority says: "As regards ourselves, we immerse all applicants who confess their faith in Christ as the divine Son of God, and for the remission of sins. We believe nothing, simply because it is in the Baptist creed, or to be found in the writings of uninspired men." Here this man affirms precisely what we affirm upon this question, as regards baptism for salvation or for remission of sins.

But, now, we ask you to consider the passage as found in Acts ii. 38, and what have we there presented? We have these words—that when the inquiring multitude on the day of Pentecost, when they inquired: "Men and brethren"—having been pierced in the heart—"what shall we do?" The answer of the apostle Peter is: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, then, the apostle is acting under the great commission. Jesus gave the commission to the apostles, "Go preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but tarry in the city of Jerusalem until you be endued with power from on high," and when the day of Pentecost was fully come, the Spirit descended upon the apostles to guide them into all truth, by which they were to be qualified to carry out this great commission, and now, under the influence of the Spirit, this vast multitude being pierced in their hearts, they cried out: "Men and brethren

what shall we do?" Peter, in accordance with this great commission, guided by the Spirit of God, the Spirit that was to bring to their remembrance whatsoever the Lord had commanded, under the influence of the Spirit the apostles now say: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Peter must therefore have meant by "for the remission of sins," acting under this commission, precisely what Jesus meant, when he says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here, then, we have the design of baptism presented. In 1st Peter iii. 18, we have also this same truth presented. Here we have these words: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, and quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long sufferings of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight, souls were saved by water. *The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" from the dead. Now, I will ask you to take all these passages as they are presented, and what must be the conviction of your minds? The commission says, if you believe and are baptized you shall be saved. Jesus says, you must be born of water and of the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom, and Ananias says to Saul of Tarsus: "Brother Saul why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Peter says, "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also save us." You take these passages, and I ask you, is it not as clearly presented as language can make this point, that the man that believes the gospel, with all his heart, repents of his sins and

submits to the authority of Jesus Christ in this institution, that the remission of sins is his to enjoy?

But, we desire to call your attention to the language of the apostle here, expressive of the design of repentance—[TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S EIGHTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED CONGREGATION: I again appear before you in the negative of the proposition. I am sorry my friend seems a little irritated and confused. I hope when he sleeps he will feel better. [Laughter.] In regard to his rule, again I quote as authority from Crosby's Greek Grammar, and that completely sets aside his rule. The best Greek scholars known confess that they are troubled in regard to the use of the tenses. Here is the statement: "The future sometimes occurs for the *present*, or *past* tense, as a less distinct and positive form of expression, or as though the action were not yet finished." In order to present something in the *present* the *future* tense is used. That is just what the gentleman's rule denied. Now, if he is a better Greek grammarian than Crosby, let him make a grammar and show wherein Crosby is wrong. Now, I hope he will not forget that I have exploded his rule, or say that I have not mentioned it. He is very forgetful sometimes. But, "*ability is the measure of responsibility.*" Well, I suppose that the Pedobaptists are responsible, and, therefore, according to the gentleman's rule, they can not be saved, unless they are immersed. I would like for the gentleman to give us the expression of his views upon that subject.

But the *prisoners*, in prison, are they not responsible? And putting them in prison, does that destroy their responsibility to repent of their sins and to seek Christ? Yet, the Dr. says *the prisoners are saved without baptism!* I would like for the

gentleman to tell just exactly how they were saved, because he has advocated a diversity of plans of salvation. Here are men saved without baptism, and yet baptism is essential to salvation! I do not think he can escape that very readily.

But, then, succession is troubling him very much, and he refers to Benedict again. Well, I desire your attention to what Benedict says. The gentleman says I said I indorsed Benedict. Well, I don't think I said any such thing. I said, however, that I indorse the point *that it was not essential that we should be able to prove from uninspired history the succession, in order to establish our church identity; but I affirm that the succession must exist, and that no church can be the church of Christ without it.* It must exist. And Mr. Benedict affirms just here, that he believes that succession exists; and he says: "The more I study the subject the stronger are my convictions, that if all the facts in the case could be disclosed, a very good succession could be made out." Now, my friend argues the question as though Mr. Benedict had said, "*If these were the facts,*" but it is not so. He affirms the facts to exist, and that if they were disclosed, a succession, and a very good one, could be made out. He was not wrong upon that subject. He believes the facts do exist. Well, some men have paid more attention to that line of history than Mr. Benedict. Whether or not we will be able to trace a succession, or whether or not this man or that man can trace it, it matters not; but the succession must exist. The gentleman referred to another statement, that Benedict quoted from Robinson, and said, that is the statement of Benedict. Mr. Robinson had reference to the *Papal, or Popish succession.* That will come up more fully in the future, however; but the Dr. gets off the subject time and again. He is very anxious to leave this proposition and get to recapitulating. I suppose he has gotten pretty well through with his materials. He has been writing his speeches and partly reading them to you; and,

now, he objects to my having my arguments arranged. I suppose they hurt the gentleman a little. But, I have called his people not exactly *hyprocrites*, but something of that sort. I know that the gentleman will not find any such expression in the report. On my part I did not use any such harsh terms, but I quoted stern and stubborn historical facts in regard to the foundation of his church, to show that the Disciples have adopted a set of principles which are calculated to confuse the minds of the people. They have what they call the Bethany dialect, and they use a series of theological terms that mean one thing, while they believe another, therefore the people are confused as to what they do mean. I have ever contended that Alexander Campbell, when he restored "the pure speech" of Canaan, as he called it, should have made a dictionary in keeping with the language of Canaan. So that when the Disciples use the term "*regeneration*," we would know what they mean. Mr. Campbell meant baptism, when he said *regeneration;* when he said *repentance to life*, he meant baptism; when he said *change of heart*, he meant change of views—an intellectual change; and thus they have confused the minds of the people in reference to these matters. I will state, brethren, that the misfortune is that it is a system of contradictions, and though, otherwise, they would not be individually chargeable with that hard name which he used. Yet the system is chargeable with that term—I mean that it contradicts itself. It allows ample room for all the errors in Christendom to come in and to be harbored in that church. In reference to Dr. Thomas, the gentleman says they repudiated him. When did they repudiate him? After he held those errors, he debated them with Mr. Campbell, and it is said they mutually agreed to go on in co-operation with each other as brother reformers, knowing that Mr. Thomas held all those fearful heresies. He does not find any such condition of things among the Baptists. What the gentleman said about

the Baptist Church here, I say that has nothing at all at present to do with the question. If they have commenced taking in men without experience in this church, as my friend states they have done—without even requiring experience, that they take them in just as they do in the gentleman's church, then I will say, that this church, if they have done that thing, erred in doing so. But I will wait for the development of the facts. I think, however, that it is a little out of place to bring in matters in regard to a private member, or members of the church in a place like this, unless the gentleman was fully informed as to the facts, and perhaps he has all the facts before him. But why don't I answer his arguments? Well, I thought I had been answering, but he has been speaking about this, that, and the other thing, and I endeavored to follow him. I did not take up my defense in regard to his argument upon baptism, because he had not developed himself upon that subject. I wait for him to do so, and will pass on. I don't deny any passage of Scripture that he read, or that he read it correctly—not at all, but it is his interpretation that I deny. I agree with Paul, in the 10th chapter of Romans, where he says "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." "How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent." That is all correct. But, I deny that the word *alone* is all that is necessary in writing of the law of God upon the mind and heart of the individual. I do not take the word *alone*. I make this statement, dear friends, that faith is said to *work by love*. Faith includes trust, and when it is faith of the heart it is *trust* in Christ; that a mere intellectual belief, or consent, or conviction, is not an adequate definition of faith. And that is about the amount of their definition. When the Disciples come to define faith, it is just simply to believe a thing to be true; for instance, those demons believed and trembled, yet they hated Christ with all the hatred of demons. Wicked

men believe that Jesus is the Son of God—that God is, and yet they hate God. They have not faith with the heart, and faith with heart embraces the affections, as found in Galatians v. 6: "Faith which worketh by love." Now, the law is to be written in the mind and in the heart. I will read upon this subject, commencing at the 10th verse and 8th chapter of Hebrews: "For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Thus showing that this law of God is to be written in the *mind* and in the *heart*. In the production of faith the evidence which is presented to the mind comes from hearing, receiving and understanding the Word of God, but the evidence that concerns the heart is the witness of the Spirit and is the love of God "shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit" given to us. Then taking the *Word* as *one* evidence, or witness, and the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Spirit as the other evidence, or witness; upon these two evidences—witnesses—is built that faith which works by love, and purifies the heart. But the gentleman's church acts upon as faith before, and independent of repentance. They are wrong in regard to faith; and they take simply the intellectual consent of the mind, instead of the faith that works by love and purifies the heart. I have produced testimony upon this subject which he has not denied, and I have still more. I have a great many quotations from Mr. Campbell, because sometimes the gentleman differs from all his brethren—from Mr. Lard, and all the writers of his church. He condemns them all, and sets up Dr. Lucas, as if he had become the

standard of the church. "O! that mine enemy had written a book," as one said in olden times. If he has become the standard of the church, I wish to know what is to be the doctrine of the church hereafter. I understand the doctrine of the gentleman's church now, but if there is to be a revolution, if there is going to be any change from this time forth, I wish to find out what it is.

But Mr. Campbell said in regard to baptism: "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our *going down* into the water that obtains the remission of sins." But we have a quotation here to show that baptism is essential to the new birth, and I believe I will read one more testimony (Mr. Campbell's Christianity Restored, page 164), where he calls water the mother of Christians: "In these days of apostasy, men have sought out many inventions. Some have attempted to get into the kingdom of heaven without being born at all. Others imagine that they can be born of the Spirit without water, and that the King is as well pleased with them who have been born without a mother as those who are lawfully born of father and mother."

That sounds like the Bethany dialect, calling *water the "mother"* of Christians. He says, again (Christianity Restored, page 243): "Down into the water you were led. Then the name of the Holy One upon your faith and upon your person was pronounced. You were then buried in the water under that name. It closed itself upon you. In its womb you were concealed. Into the Lord, as into the water, you were immersed. But in the water you continued not. Of it you were born, and from it you came forth, raised with Jesus, and rising in his strength. There your consciences were released, for there your old sins were washed away."

I have thought that one reason why the Disciples put more stress upon baptism—water—than they do upon the Holy Spirit in conversion, is, because they claim water for their

"mother," and children are likely to think most of their mother; and, therefore, they give more attention to baptism, making that the turning point of salvation.

But, to the argument that we have been presenting: We have in the commission, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" and the Dr. says that I will say, he that is saved, and then is baptized, why, he shall be saved. But, again, we have Paul's sins washed away in baptism. You may say, Do you believe that? Certainly. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And, again, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." And, then, again, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," &c. I indorse whatever I find clearly revealed in God's Word. It seems that baptism is to *wash away* our sins; that baptism is for the *remission* of sins—to wash away sins in some sense, either literally or emblematically. I will illustrate it by the Lord's Supper. The Saviour said of the bread, "This is my body." Now, I hope the Dr. will not deny that statement. That bread, Dr. Lucas, is the body of Christ, either *literally* or *emblematically*. You will say emblematically, unless you go into the Church of Rome, according to your argument, which seemed to point that way, the other night. That wine is called "the blood of Christ." How is the bread and the wine the *body* and *blood* of Christ? either *literally* or *emblematically*. You will say emblematically. Well, now, is it true, literally? Are sins really, literally, and actually washed away in baptism? Do sins attach to the surface of the body, so that when the material element, water, comes in contact with material sins they are washed away literally? The Dr. will hardly take that position, I reckon. Then, if sins are not literally, physically, and tangibly washed away in baptism, how are they washed away? *Emblematically.* This I

will indorse, that when we believe in Christ we have eternal life, and our sins are really pardoned; then, we have the emblematic washing away of sins in baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—really saved, through faith in Christ. Then, if we have the emblematic washing away of sins in baptism, it can not be the literal washing away of sins. The real washing must take place first, or you can not have the emblematic washing. Did you ever have the emblem of anything—the likeness of it—until that object existed in order to this emblem? Suppose I say I have an emblem, a picture of my friend Dr. Lucas. Here it is. I might ask a little child in this congregation, three years of age, one who is acquainted with him, "Who is that?" "That is Dr. Lucas." Now, that child tells the truth. That is Dr. Lucas in emblem—not really, literally. Well, if another child was to say, "Yes; that is Dr. Lucas," literally, "that is the man himself." O, no! that would be a bad mistake; but no greater mistake than the gentleman's church has made in making the real washing away of sins in baptism.

I call your attention to the fact, now, that John's baptism was just as much *for the remission of sins* as the baptism on the day of Pentecost. See Mark i. 4, where John preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" and, yet, every time sins were pardoned under the administration of Jesus, baptism was not known as a condition of that pardon. And the Saviour himself *made* disciples before he baptized them. According to the gentleman's definition of disciple, one is made a disciple, a child of God, when he is baptized into Christ. They were *made disciples*, and then baptized. I have quoted passage after passage showing that sins were pardoned during the personal ministry of Christ, independent of baptism. This baptism was not a condition of pardon, though baptism was said to be *for the remission of sins.*

Now, the leprous man (by referring to Leviticus xiv.), the

leprous person was separated from the congregation—outside of the camp: when the priest examined him every seventh day, and it was discovered that his leprousy was removed, then he was brought to the door of the tabernacle, and was ceremonially cleansed in the presence of the congregation. So the Saviour, in keeping with the same idea, said to that man, the leper, whom he had cleansed, "Go, show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing the things that Moses commanded." This shows that there was first the real cleansing, and then the formal cleansing. That is the point I wish to establish in this connection.

But, then, I call you to John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This is the passage about which there is a dispute. Some say that it has no reference whatever to baptism, and I am of that opinion. But there are others who say that it has reference to baptism—that after one is born of the Spirit, is a child of God, he must be "born of water," in order to membership in the visible church—making two births. I do not think that the best interpretation. But either way it does not help the gentleman's doctrine—not one particle, if it is baptism. But why did he introduce that, when he said there was no Christian baptism or kingdom at that time? The Saviour was talking to Nicodemus in the present tense of what must occur *now?* But the Dr. says that there was neither Christian kingdom nor Christian baptism! The gentleman has introduced a passage that overturns all his arguments for the establishment of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. Now, then, you have the Christian *baptism and kingdom* prior to Pentecost, according to your argument. Otherwise, you have introduced an argument that you knew to be irrelevant. Don't you see where you have placed yourself? No kingdom until Pentecost! Yet the Saviour says, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom!"

He might be born forty times, and he could not see it, according to the gentleman's doctrine. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom." The gentleman is mistaken in regard to the meaning, for "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit"—and if baptism is a part of that new birth of the Spirit, then that which is born again is flesh! So the gentleman is certainly wrong.

Well, on the day of Pentecost we have the argument that repentance and baptism are coupled together in order to procure the remission of sins. I will call your attention to the fact that these two commands are not united together in order to procure the same result. Repentance—*metanoēsate*—is a complete command in itself, and has a different nominative, is in a different number and person, and different voice from *baptisthētō*, the word that is used to indicate baptism. That being so, whatever the remission of sins means, it is applied to baptism, and not connected with both verbs to secure the same result. You can not find a parallel case in the New Testament that will justify that interpretation.

Now, a passage or two in regard to the plan of salvation. The case of Abraham, that the Dr. said was pardoned, or justified, when he offered up his son Isaac. I wish your attention, especially, to the 3d chapter of Galatians, 17th verse: "And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." That covenant, he will not deny, was the covenant of grace, confirmed to Abraham, four hundred and thirty years before the law. Isaac, his son, that was offered, was born four hundred years before the law. If my friend will study chronology, he will not deny this. That covenant was thirty years before the birth of Isaac, when Abraham believed in the Lord, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, as found in Genesis xv. 6. Then Abra-

ham had the confirmation of the covenant forty odd years before he was justified by works, when he offered Isaac, and if he was in the covenant of grace, he was a child of God, and his sins pardoned. There is no doubt about that. And this justification was such a justification—not in the sense of pardon—as every true follower of Christ may have in an act of strong faith and obedience. Abraham showed his faith by his works; it could not be justification in the sense of pardon.

But let us look again, Rom. iv. 9-11: "*Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had*, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." Before his circumcision he received that righteousness of faith—pardon. The circumcision took place nearly twenty years before the time he offered up Isaac; and yet, he had been justified by faith in the sight of God, before his circumcision. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Fourth Evening.

DR. LUCAS' NINTH ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the providence of Him upon whom we are dependent for all things, we are together again to call your attention to some things that we propose to submit in connection with the proposition that we have affirmed in relation to the kingdom of the Messiah. Before we proceed with our argument, we propose to call your attention to some points presented by my friend in his last reply, and first, I wish to refer to his exposition of John iii. 5. He stated that this portion of Scripture can not bear upon the proposition which it was introduced to prove—namely, baptism in connection with faith and repentance; that it can not in any way prove the truth of that proposition, from the fact that this language was spoken before—according to my proposition—the kingdom of Jesus was established. We state that this portion of Scripture had a future bearing, and was prospective in its character just precisely as the great commission given to the apostles, and many other portions of Scripture, to which we might call your attention. When Jesus said to the Disciples, "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and, while he gave this commission, he called upon them and required them to remain in Jerusalem until

they were endued with power from on High; until they were qualified by the descent of the Holy Spirit, to carry out his will as embodied in that great commission. But, in order to narrow the argument upon this subject down to a point, if you please, that we can all comprehend, I will state, that I am perfectly willing to leave the issue now before us to the proper interpretation of Acts ii. 38; that while there are other passages which I regard as bearing directly on my proposition, I am perfectly willing to risk the whole issue of this question of baptism and the remission of sins, upon the proper interpretation of Acts ii. 38, in connection with the great commission given to the apostles by the Saviour. The Spirit of God was to guide the apostles into all truth, and bring to their remembrance whatsoever the Lord commanded them, and this great commission was to be the rule of their action. On the day of Pentecost, after the ascension of the Saviour, we find the apostles preached for the first time under this commission. I presume the gentleman will concede the truth of the statement, that the apostles, being guided by the influence of the Spirit of God, on that occasion, that Peter presented to that people just what is embraced in the great commission, so far as baptism is concerned. Peter must have preached to that people on baptism as well as on other points, just what was presented in that commission. But, we stated, on last evening, in order that the gentleman be in harmony with the commission, that it should read differently from what it does, as he affirms that none but those who are Christians, the pardoned, the saved from sin, the justified, and the accepted of the Father in the beloved, should be baptized; that that commission should read: "He that believeth and *is saved* shall be baptized." But that is not the reading of the commission. It reads: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Faith and baptism then stand this side of the salvation presented to our view, and as this was the commission

by which the apostles were to be governed and were to be controlled, when the apostle Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," he had baptism this side of that remission, or salvation. This, we say, must be true, for the apostle was governed by the commission that the Lord gave to him.

We propose noticing this 2d chapter of Acts further in a few moments. We desire to notice some other points presented by the gentleman. He refers our minds to the case of the prisoners again, where it was utterly impossible for them to be baptized. They had faith, and were willing to do all in their power to obey God; but, then, they had no ability. They had no power to obey God, from the fact of their being incarcerated in prison, and the authorities prevented them from submitting to this ordinance. They could not render this obedience. In connection with this case, we submit the proposition to which we have already referred, that *ability* is the *measure* of *responsibility*, and we state, that the infant child is not held responsible before God as is the father or the mother. The infant child is not held responsible before the law, or in the sight of God, as is that individual who has arrived at the years of responsibility, and it is not required to obey the law as is the father. It is not required to obey the gospel, because it has no such power. It is not condemned because it does not obey the gospel; neither is it condemned because it does not obey the laws of the land. Here again, then, we say that the truth of our proposition is recognized, that ability is the measure of responsibility; and whenever the gentleman shows that the individual that is the subject of gospel address (and we are talking of persons of that class in this discussion) has no power to do this or that, then we say there is no responsibility in that particular case; and we present again our proposition, that ability is the measure of responsibility.

But he referred to the word "alone" again, as simply intel-

lectual faith. Well, we have presented our views on that subject, and we have presented them in the language of the Word of God. The position occupied by my brethren, as a body, as a church, is well known, that there is no faith of any value at all that has not in its embrace not only the intellect, but the affections of the heart. *He that believeth with all the heart* has that faith, and only he has the faith that the gospel requires. Consequently, the gentleman is entirely outside of this investigation when he talks about *merely* intellectual faith. For I submit this proposition, that neither he himself, nor any member of his church ever did, ever can, ever will believe the gospel with more than ALL THE HEART! For this faith, and nothing less than this, do we contend. But, the law is written in the mind, and in the heart, referring to the covenant quoted from the Old Testament Scriptures in Hebrews by Paul. Well, we believe every word of that; consequently, we shall not occupy your time in discussing a question of that kind. There is not a single syllable there presented but what we believe as firmly, as fully, and as heartily as my friend, or any other being upon the footstool of God.

But, in regard to the cleansing of the leper, he says, again, Jesus had cleansed him, but, according to the ceremonial law, he was not cleansed; but he was to offer for his cleansing according to that ceremonial law, according to the command of Moses. Now, I did not really here get his point; I did not fully understand whether he meant to say that he was to go and offer for his cleansing—that is, because he was cleansed—or whether he understands the preposition here employed, "in order to;" whether it is "in order to," or "because of;" consequently, I wait for him to make this point more clear. In regard to the Acts of the Apostles, also, when it is said "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," when he shall have defined

his position fully upon this question, then we shall give it our attention.

But he refers to Abraham, again, and quotes from Romans, where Paul speaks of Abraham being justified by faith, and his faith being imputed unto him for righteousness. Well, now, we want to present for your consideration what the inspired James says upon this subject, and surely the apostle James is equal authority with that of Paul. But the apostle James presents the matter in a clearer light, if possible, than that of Paul, and we show that he refers to the very same thing, by language that can not be misunderstood. In the 2d chapter of James' letter, commencing at the 20th verse: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" And I might address this very language of the inspired apostle to my friend. "Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled." What Scripture? Why, the very Scripture quoted by Paul, the very Scripture to which the gentleman invited your attention. "And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." The Scripture was fulfilled which said, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. Fulfilled when? Why, when Abraham's faith was made perfect by offering his son Isaac upon the altar. This is the language of James the apostle upon the very same subject, and it is so plain that it needs no comment to make it plainer.

With these remarks we desire to call your attention now to Acts ii. 38, where Peter responds to the inquiring Pentecostians, "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the

name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." First, we take the language as it is here presented, and see what idea this language conveys to the mind. We have here two commands, *repent* and *be baptized*, and the design expressed is for the remission of sins; but, suppose that baptism is not in the passage at all, that there is but one command, and that command is "repent," and we say "Repent, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, no one will have any difficulty in understanding the point presented by the apostle, every one will see at once that the individual is called upon to repent in order that he may receive and enjoy the remission of sins, not because his sins had been remitted, but that they may be remitted. Now, we will suppose there is no repentance in the passage at all, and we take up the passage and quote baptism. We leave the first part of the sentence out, and we say, "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, there is but one change, the change of the one word "baptism" instead of "repentance;" "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, what does it mean? Well, says one, it means because your sins are pardoned that nobody but the Christian, the pardoned individual, is called upon to be baptized; consequently, it means now, "be baptized, because your sins are pardoned;" yet, the very sentence, or part of the expression, that conveys the design had in view in the command, is just precisely as it was before. But, now, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, what does it mean when merely repentance? It means that you might receive the remission of sins. When repentance was dropped and baptism was the command, it means because your sins are pardoned, as none but a Christian has the right to be baptized. Now, when repentance and baptism are connected by the conjunction "Repent, and be baptized every

one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," then, we ask, what does the passage mean thus expressed? Does it mean both, "because of" and "in order that" you may receive the remission of sins? Does it mean these two opposite ideas? Are these two opposing ideas expressed by the very same words, in the very same sentence, in the very same connection. Now, we ask you to stop and think seriously upon this question.

But, then, my friend says that the design, as expressed by εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, that it has no reference here to repentance, but that it expresses the design connected with the command to "be baptized," and the reason of this is, he says, that repentance is here in the second person, imperative and plural in number. Well, we agree upon that—we have no controversy so far as the grammar of the word is concerned—that is, so far as its grammatical position in the sentence is concerned. It is imperative of the second person plural in number—there is no mistake about that. But, then, the second command, he says, is imperative of the third person and singular in number. Well, that is true. We have no controversy with regard to that; but, now, as we have here two commands, the one of the second person and plural, and the other of the third person singular—that they do not have the same subject, and, therefore, the design as expressed for the remission of sins, can not refer to both of these commands. This, I understand to be the argument of my friend on this passage, and this is the argument put forth by Mr. Williams, in his examination of this passage, and who has also written a work upon Campbellism, as well as my friend. This is his position, and whatever credit there may be in it, my friend is not entitled to it, for he has borrowed it from Mr. Williams, and, in his little work on Campbellism, he gives Mr. Williams the credit of this criticism. But Mr. Williams never regarded himself as a scholar, and no one else ever regarded him as such. I am

perfectly astonished that my friend should adopt this criticism, especially while he has what may be regarded as good and safe counsel in Greek criticism. Now, I state this, that so far as this passage is concerned, though the one verb is of the second person, plural, imperative; and the other of the third person, singular, imperative; that they are frequently joined together for the purpose of securing, if you please, the one result, or leading to the one definite end. There is a rule that bears directly upon this question, and I will read you the rule as presented by Kühner's Greek Grammar—one that stands as high as any other work in all this country. On page 309 we have this rule: "The second person, imperative, instead of the third, is sometimes connected with the indefinite pronoun τις or πᾶς τις, and even with a substantive and τίσ, and hence, also, the transition of the third person to the second." Here, then, we have this rule, as presented by a grammar of the very highest authority. And now we give you a case. We have a number here, taken from the classics, and we give you now a case from Euripides, Bacchæ, as found in verse 173: "Let some one go and announce that Teiresias is seeking him." Here, then, is a sentence. We state that "let some one go" (ἴτω) is imperative and of the third person, and "announce" (εἰσάγγελλε) is imperative and second person. Here, then, we have these two verbs—one of the second person, imperative, and the other of the third person, imperative, and both are employed in this sentence in order to accomplish a definite and single end. But we give you another case in Euripides, found in this play, presented in verses 346 and 350: "Let some one go quickly, and having arrived at the seats of this one, where he is accustomed to observe the flight of birds, overturn them"—that is the seats, not birds—"and set them up inversely, and scatter his garlands, or fillets, to the winds and storms."

Now, here we have presented of Euripides, in this play

"let some one go," *στειχέτω*, imperative, third person; "overturn," *Τριαινου*, imperative, second person; and "set up," *ἀνάστρεψον*, imperative, second person; and "scatter," translated from *μέθες*, imperative, second person singular. Here, then, we have these verbs in the same sentence used in order to accomplish the one result and one end; and here we have the third person imperative, and the second person imperative, used as in the passage to which reference has already been made, used expressive of the one design, one intent, and, in this form presented, it simply tends to make the requirement or the instruction more intensified in its nature—if possible, to make it stronger than being presented in another form. And we would say, if we had the time to thoroughly investigate this matter, we have no doubt but, in the language of Benedict, when he speaks of the succession, "that a very good succession could be made out, if we only had the facts." If we had the facts of the case, a very good succession could be made out, and so we say that we think that if we had time to investigate this matter thoroughly, that we might find other passages in the New Testament Scriptures where these verbs are similarly used. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S NINTH REPLY.

BROTHER MODERATORS AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: It does seem that my worthy friend can not comprehend the position of Mr. Benedict. He affirmed, just as he sat down, that Mr. Benedict said, "that if we had the facts, a succession could be made out." That is not the statement of Mr. Benedict. He said, "if the facts were developed," recognizing that the facts exist. But he goes for his examples to the classic Greek of Euripides, but fails to give the result to be obtained in the case where he thinks he finds parallel examples to Acts ii. 38. I wait for him to develop his position upon those criticisms.

I wish your attention to the speech in order. John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." He said this had a prospective, future bearing, and there was no Christian baptism, no kingdom yet set up. The Saviour spoke that language to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom;" and, in the 10th verse, he reproved Nicodemus for not understanding this subject: "Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?" Then, if the Dr.'s position is correct, that there was no kingdom, and no baptism, the Saviour made a mistake in reproving Nicodemus for ignorance on the subject. So, according to his own position, he has lost his question, and is willing to give that up, as far as the present discussion is concerned, and stake it all on the 2d chapter of Acts. But I

want your attention to the fact that these two commands are not associated together to obtain the same result. If so, he can not find a parallel example in the New Testament. In the 3d chapter of Acts, 19th verse, they are commanded to "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Here we find the two verbs with the very same construction throughout, with the same nominative, and so where it is commanded for them to repent and turn to God. Let him find his examples in God's Word, given by the Holy Spirit. I come to examine now, in connection with this, the passage in the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the same apostle preaching. He said to him, that is, to Christ, at the house of Cornelius (10th ch., 43d v.), "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." The gentleman can not find a prophet giving testimony to baptism as a condition of pardon. Peter, after the day of Pentecost, appeals to the prophets for the plan of salvation that he preached on that occasion, and referring to that occasion, in Acts xv. 9, he said that God "put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Showing, then, that as there was no difference, and in this case all who believed received remission of sins, then on the day of Pentecost they received remission of sins through faith in Christ, and then the washing away of sins in baptism was only declarative, or emblematical.

But notice, again, the 44th verse: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water,

that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Thus showing that these original converts received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, spoke with tongues, and magnified God. All this occurred before they were baptized; and the prophecy concerning the gift of the Holy Spirit testifies that this Spirit was to be poured out upon God's servants and upon his handmaids—showing positively that the original converts were the servants of God before baptism. They had the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and were able to speak with tongues that they never learned before, and yet we are told they were unpardoned, unconverted sinners!

Again, we call your attention now to Gal. iii. 6: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Here the apostle emphatically teaches that believers are the children of Abraham, and he classes them with him when they have the same character of faith that Abraham had; but if baptism is a condition of pardon, then they were not pardoned as Abraham was, because baptism was not a condition of pardon to Abraham. Then they can not be the children of Abraham by faith; they can not be saved upon the same plan as Abraham was. The justification of Abraham by faith, as we read last night, and as the report will show, was while he was in uncircumcision, before the time of the birth of Isaac, consequently, long before the time that he offered Isaac upon the altar. I wonder if the gentleman understands that Abraham's sins were pardoned, and that he became a convert for the first

time when he offered Isaac. If this was the plan of salvation, by offering a man's son, according to the old dispensation, and as Abraham was the only man that did so, then he is the only man saved, according to the gentleman's idea. Remarkably strong notion, it seems to me. Then, what is meant by the justification of Abraham, when he offered Isaac? It is infallibly certain that Abraham was justified by faith forty years before that occurrence, because in the 3d chapter of Galatians, 17th verse, we find that the covenant was confirmed of God in Christ four hundred and thirty years before the law, and this was twenty-nine years before the covenant of circumcision, and thirty years before the birth of Isaac, and more than forty years before he offered Isaac on the altar.

But, again, we have the testimony of God's Word, John iii., commencing with the 14th verse: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life;" showing clearly that the believer in Christ—on that one lifted up as Moses lifted up the serpent—possesses eternal or everlasting life. This is clear. It is as positive as language can make it; and if he has this belief before baptism, he possesses eternal life before baptism: and if he possesses that eternal life before baptism, his sins are pardoned before baptism. But, to escape this difficulty, the gentleman took the position, in a former discussion, that baptism was an element of faith, and embraced in it. Then, if that be so, when one believes with all his heart, he has already been baptized—that is, he is baptized because he is baptized—would be the absurdity of his argument. Then, we have the example, as already given, of the salvation or pardon of the thief upon the cross, and of the publican, under the administration of Christ. But he says this was before the day of Pentecost, and when he does that he rejects that part of the New Testament from his creed. Then, again, I have

already quoted upon this subject, I believe, John v. 24, that whosoever believeth on him "hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

I now pass (as I believe I have answered the argument of the gentleman) to my negative argument. He is trying to prove that the church with which he stands identified, the present organization, is the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. I deny this, because it teaches the doctrine, I will say the Papish doctrine, of church salvation; that out of the church there is no salvation; that in the church men are saved, and that the church has the power to save or damn men by taking them in or keeping them out. I read Millennial Harbinger, vol. 5—and before the commencement of the reading let me explain. The gentleman complained because I read so much from his authors, and he is afraid that my part of the book will not appear so well as his. He is disposed to praise his part and condemn mine. He is welcome to do all the boasting of that kind, because I think it is necessary for his case under the circumstances. At least he thinks so. But I have not so much vanity as to wish nothing in the book except what I have said myself. I want it to stand as a storehouse of proof texts, settling the doctrine of the gentleman's church. As I have written heretofore upon the subject, and some have, by the wholesale, denounced my works, and have asserted that these quotations are not correct, I wanted a representative man (which I now have) to stand before me, and if I made a quotation which is not correct, or an incorrect application, he will correct me, and I intend that these quotations shall stand for future years, and perhaps for future generations.

Now, I will read Millennial Harbinger, vol. 5, p. 374: "There is not one voice heard in all the world outside of the boundaries of the present reformation, calling upon the people

to return to the *original gospel and order of things.*" They contend that no man can be saved without the original gospel and order of things. Outside their own church there are no men that preach that gospel. Thus, no man can be saved under the preaching of any gospel but the disciples, according to his position and argument.

Again, Mr. Campbell, on baptism, p. 257, says: "As we have then but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and that baptism is 'for the remission of sins'—to give us through faith and repentance, a solemn pledge and assurance of pardon—any other baptism is a human invention, and of no value; wanting, as it does, the sanction of the Lord Jesus, who ordained it." This shows, that unless baptism has the proper design, it has no value. Then, those that have been baptized among the Baptists without the design that they advocate, and have gone over to them without baptism, I will state, according to this position, are still unpardoned; they are still in their sins and in their gore.

But he got a little pressed last night, and made a personal allusion to somebody that had been received into this church without rebaptism, and without a Christian experience. Well, dear friends, I know this, that Baptists do not usually do this, and I do not suppose they did here. We receive no one that has not professed the love of God shed abroad in his heart. But, I make this remark, in connection with the case he referred to, that I hope the Dr. will chastise any Baptists that are inconsistent in receiving the administrations of *his* church. I do not do it, and have never done so, and, until my mind changes, I do not propose to do so. But, some of the brethren differing slightly upon this point, have, in some cases, received members, and especially when they professed that this conversion was before baptism, and when they were getting, as they regarded, a good member—one that was the cream, as it were, of the gentleman's church! But they have

acted inconsistently in this. But, in the country where I live, I know it to be a fact, that if one gets turned out of the Baptist Church for bad conduct, and the Disciples can get him to join their church, they think they have got a sweet morsel—just on their baptism too, after they have been excluded for immoral conduct. I do not think we do it as often as they do. If we do, we ought not.

But I read, again, from Christian Baptist, p. 521: "Knowing that the efficacy of this blood is to be communicated to our consciences in the way which God has pleased to appoint, we stagger not at the promise of God, but flee to the sacred ordinance which brings the blood of Jesus in contact with our consciences. Without knowing and believing this, immersion is as empty as a blasted nut. The shell is there, but the kernel is wanting." This shows that, according to Mr. Campbell, unless they believe at the very time that baptism brings the blood of Christ in contact with their consciences, then baptism is invalid. What becomes of those that went out from the Baptists in early times and joined the Disciples upon Baptist immersion? Just as certain as the doctrine as here read is true, they are in their sins, and in their blood, and ought to be baptized for the remission of their sins, according to the gentleman's doctrine.

Millennial Harbinger, vol. 5, p. 251, Mr. Campbell says: "I do, indeed, contend for the restoration of the original gospel and order of things, and do think that no sect in Christendom has the one or the other." They are the only denomination on earth, according to their testimony, that has the *original gospel or order of things.* I wish to quote one other extract. Mr. Lipscomb—Gospel Advocate for 1867, p. 770—says: "No church founded by man can give immortality to its members, because it can not bestow what it does not possess. God founded a church that will stand forever, 'that the gates of hell shall not prevail against.' That one church alone can

give immortality to its members, because it, having received it from its immortal founder, can impart it to every member of the body." I will state here, dear friend, that the triple-crowned tyrant that sits upon the seven-hilled city, scarcely ever uttered a more obnoxious sentiment in regard to his own power than that the church can give immortality to every member that joins it. The church can not do it; and I will state here, there is but one name given among men whereby we must be saved, and that is the name of the holy child Jesus. His church gives immortality! Remember, dear friends, that Mr. Campbell was the founder of the gentleman's church—the "Christian Church," so called; and if salvation is alone in that church, if it had not been for Mr. Campbell my friend never could have been saved—could not reach heaven; his church would not have existed. Consequently, in that sense, Mr. Campbell becomes the disciple, savior, and their deliverer. I know they sometimes attempt to repudiate him, but then again they honor him very highly. I have here Mr. Lard's Quarterly for 1866, and, on p. 306, Mr. Bartholomew takes the ground (the quotation is too long to read) that Mr. Campbell was prophesied of in Rev. x. 9, where John was called on to take "the little book" out of the hand of the angel, and he ate it up and it was sweet in his mouth and bitter in his "belly"—stomach. He said this foretold Alexander Campbell; that he was to take the Bible and eat it up, and that Mr. Campbell was the *one* that unloosed the seven seals of the sealed book, and has preached it to the nations. He represents Alexander Campbell as the *lion of the tribe of reformers*, and as having eaten up the book, and it made him bitter; and that is the reason he said so many bitter things against those who oppose him, I reckon, because it made him bitter. And yet the Dr. can repudiate Mr. Campbell just as he pleases.

I will read a statement here from Bro. Taylor's book—a

quotation from Mr. D. P. Henderson, p. 46—as follows: "Baptism is the central link in the chain of pardon—the last of the series which brings us to the everlasting kingdom."—Quoted from p. 42, tract, Christian Baptism. Showing that not only Mr. Campbell, but nearly all—yes, all of the Disciples, more or less—contended for baptismal salvation. But, then, I will state that I never found one but what admitted that one may be saved without it! And yet they do not teach two plans of salvation! The Dr. has the prisoners saved without baptism. Mr. Campbell admitted that Pedobaptists might be saved without baptism. Also, according to his rule of responsibility—*ability being the measure of responsibility*—the Dr. must contend that the heathen are saved, and lost without baptism. Then he will have three, or four, or perhaps five plans of salvation!

My friend said that Jesus had a right to save men as he pleased while on earth, but now he has given us the law of pardon. I will state that the Son of God, having all the power in heaven and on earth, has the same power now that he ever had. He never pardoned men at any time contrary to his plan of pardon; and I will affirm that he never had two plans of pardon—never. There is *one* God and *one* mediator, and *one* plan of salvation; and the plan that saved Abel will save the last sinner that is ever saved through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

But the Dr. does not answer my questions that I have put to him with so much earnestness:

1. *I ask him if any one can be saved out of the church?*
2. *Was the baptism administered by Christ through the apostles, Christian baptism?*
3. *When did the original church become extinct?*
4. *When was the kingdom set up a second time?*
5. *Who set up the kingdom a second time?*

6. *How did men become children of God when there was no kingdom?*

7. *How are Pedobaptists saved?*

8. *What were the terms of pardon to those prisoners that were saved?*

9. *Where is the name "Christian Church" found in the Bible?*

I wish to call this congregation to witness *that the gentleman* will not *answer these questions;* and I suppose he has a pretty good reason for it, because it can not be done according to his principles. He will lose his position if he attempts to answer these questions that I have placed before him.

But I wish to give you another statement or two in regard to faith. Mr. Campbell (Christian Baptism, p. 69) says: "There is but one way of believing any testimony, human or divine, and that is, to admit it to be true." Yet, the Dr. talks about *faith with the heart*, and moral elements of faith! Did not the demons admit that Jesus Christ was the Son of God? Did not sinners throughout all the land, unpardoned and impenitent sinners, admit that Jesus is the Son of the living God? Is this *the faith?* Is that all there is in faith? Mr. Lard says, in his confession of faith, in his creed, art. 6 (Quarterly for 1867, p. 345), "that faith and belief are identical; that faith is the simple conviction that what the Bible says is true; and that the notion of various kinds of faith is false." This shows that it is simply the confession or admission that the Bible is true; that it is all the faith the Disciples demand of the candidate; and when he has no doubt about that, they call that believing with the heart. The Disciples do not understand that the Holy Spirit has moved and changed the heart from *hatred* to *love*, when they say, "believing with the heart"—not a word of it. It is simply there by the word *alone*. Gospel Preached, p. 41, Mr. Franklin's book—he says: "The belief, then, with the whole heart,

that God raised him, amounts to the same as the belief that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God." That is all of the *believing with the whole heart*—simply that Jesus is the Christ. Admitting that Jesus is the Christ, according to this testimony, *is believing with the whole heart!*

The Reformation is not, then, the church of Christ, because it denies the gospel faith, that faith with the heart. That faith that purifies the hearts of men is essential to church membership. The Disciples would not refuse one that has heart faith, if he comes; they will take in almost all sorts of doctrine into their church, if the individual will believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and be immersed. They will receive Dr. Thomas, with his errors; they will receive a Universalist, with his errors; and they will receive a Unitarian, with his errors. I would like to call the gentleman's attention, as I close, to what Benedict says in regard to his church, inasmuch as he is so fond of calling our attention to Benedict, page 916: "CAMPBELLITES, OR REFORMERS.—*Rev. Alexander Campbell*, who, I believe is admitted on all hands to be the Corypheus of this very wide-spread community, is a native of Scotland, where he was educated among the Pedobaptists." Here, then, he says that Mr. Campbell was their leader—admitted to be so. The gentleman says that Benedict is one of the best historians in the world: no sort of doubt about that. Then, according to his own witness, Benedict settles the question, that instead of Christ being the leader of the gentleman's church, Mr. Campbell is the leader. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' TENTH ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As the Scriptures say, "The first shall be last, and the last first," I will give you a verification of the truth, so far as order is concerned, by examining the gentleman's speech, the last of it first. With regard to Benedict, the gentleman says that I said he is one of the best historians in the world. The gentleman is just simply mistaken. I said he is one of the best Baptist historians. But the gentleman now appeals to Benedict. Last night he quoted Jeter. For what? Why, to tell just what we believe, and what we do not believe. Jeter is a professed enemy, and has written a work against Alexander Campbell. Mr. Benedict is a Baptist, and I will venture to say, if my friend had called upon his little book to testify, that it would have said some hard things against us, too. But the gentleman brings up Baptists that are professedly writing against our people to prove this, that, and the other; and I will just simply say to the gentleman, that they are not authority in this case. Jeter has written a book, and my friend has written a book, and Brother Taylor has written a little book that he has quoted to-night on Campbellism, and Brother Williams has written a book; and they have all been trying to kill what they call the Campbellites. But there is one peculiar trait in regard to the cause that they propose to kill, that the more they kill it, the more it will not die. That is the result of all these efforts. But, to the gentleman's questions: He brings out a long string of questions. I might ask him a great many questions. But he has not shown that

his questions have any bearing on the proposition, to settle it one way or the other. I might answer it this way, or that way. I might say to the gentleman, I can not answer them at all. I might give any of these answers; still, it would have no bearing on this proposition whatever; and I am perfectly willing he shall just add to the number as many more, and then they may go into the book that we expect to make up on this discussion, and there they may stand unanswered. I am perfectly willing, so far as these questions are concerned, unless he can show that they legitimately bear upon the proposition that we are discussing. They have nothing at all to do with it, except for the gentleman to keep up a kind of appearance, as the boy did when he went whistling by the graveyard.

But he referred to the individual last night that the Baptists had received into their church that they did not baptize over again. I simply say that the gentleman is mistaken again. I said that the Baptist Church had received individuals into their church from the Christian Church. I gave no names at all; but I said that the Baptist Church received individuals, and I say several of them, where they demanded no experience, and they did not rebaptize them. Yet, the gentleman said, in his discussion at Canton, that he did not regard our baptism as baptism at all. "It was not baptism," he said; and hence he objected to the language "rebaptized," "because," said he, "they have never been baptized." Hence, the gentleman has members in his church, having the privileges of the church, and of the Lord's table, that he says have never been baptized. Then, why do not you let your Methodist brethren in also, and let them commune with you, as they stand precisely, in my friend's estimation, on the same ground? He ought to let them in, because, he says, "they are good people, and the Lord's people, and have the name Christian," precisely as these others.

But he speaks about my being very anxious to get a great deal into that book, and that I seem to think that he is not likely to get much of Dr. Ray into the book. Well, this audience will fully bear testimony to the fact, whether they bear out this statement or not. They will testify to the fact, let the case go with me as it may, that Dr. Ray is destined to have but very little in that book, for all the time he has quoted Campbell and Lard; and I intended to request the gentleman to give us a little more Campbell and Lard before I sat down; but, then, he has it in his lesson, and will give it without request. It is Campbell and Lard, and Lard and Campbell, that constitute the gentleman's magazine. This is about the amount of his material on hand, and he certainly would be in a very destitute condition, if it were not for Campbell and Lard, and Lard and Campbell. I hope the next time he gets up he will give us a little more from Lard and Campbell [laughter], and keep on to the close of this discussion quoting from Campbell and Lard; for I know from former discussions that it is in your lesson, and you are ruined if you do not say it. Now, continue to quote Campbell and Lard, and Lard and Campbell [laughter]. It is in his lesson, and he can not say his lesson unless he says that. So, let him say on.

But I am not so anxious, so far as my statements are concerned, in regard to that expected book; but I will tell you what I do want. I want to get as many statements of the word of the inspired apostles into that book as I can, and, consequently, this audience will bear testimony that I have been quoting passage of Scripture after passage, passage after passage, in order that I may get as much of the Lord's Word into that book as possible. I have relied upon the testimony of the divine volume for what we have presented for your consideration.

He stated that I said that baptism is an inherent element of

faith. The gentleman is mistaken again. I said that Mr. Lynd said so, a Baptist. I quoted the authority and I will quote it to-night, before we shall have done with our investigation on this occasion. But, Euripides—he said he would not notice what I said in regard to Euripides until I had developed the argument. Well, I presented a case where we have precisely the difficulties to which he refers, where we have a verb of the second person imperative, and a verb of the third person imperative, and where the language was addressed to the very same individuals and *having the* same purpose before the mind, and expressed in that language. And his argument is in regard to the 2d chapter of Acts of the Apostles, that repentance was not to the same individuals addressed that Baptism was; that repentance was not required of the same individuals that baptism was; because repentance of the second person imperative, and plural in number, and that baptism is of the third person imperative, and singular in number; that the two commands are not given to the same persons, and that the design expressed there is not presented in connection with repentance and baptism. Right here we affirm that, so far as the examples quoted from Euripides, that they are parallel, so far as the point in argument is concerned with the passage in the Acts of the Apostles. But he said he would not notice Euripides. Probably there is a reason for that. He borrowed the argument from Brother Williams on the Acts of the Apostles, and probably he will have to wait and borrow an argument on Euripides, before he can reply. That may possibly be the case. But, we were looking over while the gentleman was talking in regard to these very same verbs, the similar ones, where they stand grammatically in the same position with repentance and baptism. It is in the 2d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and he said that we could not find in the Word of God any such case. While we were looking over the Scriptures, our eye

fell upon a few cases. We will give them, but before we give them, I ask the gentleman to translate Acts ii. 38—to translate that passage before this audience, and tell this audience just what Peter said. Now, I ask him to do it, and if he does not do it, I will; but, I ask him to do it, as he has taken a position upon the question, and say just what Peter said. Probably he will want Brother Williams to give him a translation before he can answer the question, but I call upon him to translate the passage, and, I say, if he does not, I will, and say just what the apostle Peter has said. But, then, we want to give you a passage. Now, we call your attention to the 1st Corinthians xiv. 37. Here we have the words: *Ὥστε, ἀδελφοί, ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν, καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν γλῶσσαις μὴ κωλύετε. Πάντα εὐσχημόρως καὶ κατα τάξιν γινέσθω.*

Now, here we have read you this passage, and we state that *Ὥστε* is of the second person imperative, plural, as the word rendered "repentance" in the Acts of the Apostles, and *κυλύετε* is of the second person imperative, as in the Acts of the Apostles, and *καὶ κατα ταξιν γϊνέσθω* is of the third person singular, imperative, as in the Acts of the Apostles, and that this language is addressed—these words, second imperative and third imperative, and connected by the conjunction *καὶ* is —addressed to the very same persons, and having the same end in view—addressed not to two classes of persons, but to one class. Then, here again, we have in the 13th verse of the 16th chapter of Corinthians, very similar language, where we have the verbs, first imperative and second person, third imperative or second person plural, and the third person imperative singular. So far as these points are concerned, then, they are precisely as they are found in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, so far as the imperative second and plural, and the imperative third and singular of the verbs are concerned, and addressed to the same persons. I will state to the gentleman that we can not only find this state of facts

in Euripides, but I say again that we can find the same in other passages in the New Testament Scriptures; and, as Benedict says, if we had the time to develop the facts, no doubt we could find a great many where we have precisely the point as presented here in the gentleman's argument against my position upon the Acts of the Apostles; and when this criticism, with these passages, appear in that expected book which this debate is designed to produce, and it should happen to fall into the hands of those who are scholars, I am satisfied that the gentleman's criticisms, borrowed from his Brother Williams, will, at least, excite a smile among scholars. Now let the gentleman go to the passages to which we have referred, and see if we have stated falsely in regard to these passages in Corinthians. We say, so far as the point before us is concerned, that they are identical, having connected therewith the verbs imperative second person plural, and the verbs imperative third person singular, and addressed to the same persons with the same design before the mind of the one addressing them. Then there are other passages, we say, that might be found in classic Greek, and in the New Testament Greek, of a like nature, and to these we invite the gentleman's attention; and let him show that we are wrong upon the question.

But we call your attention to baptism emblematic. The gentleman barely mentioned it in his last speech. I had intended to have noticed it in a former one. Said he: "Baptism in these passages is emblematic." Suppose, for the sake of argument now, that we admit that thus far the gentleman is correct. But, said he, "It is precisely as the picture is of the individual to the individual;" and he spoke of your humble servant in order to illustrate, and said that the child looking at Dr. Lucas' picture, would answer: "That is Dr. Lucas, because it is the picture of Dr. Lucas," and of any one else precisely the same. I affirm that the picture of a man is not necessary

in order to the existence of the man; he exists independently of the picture, and is a man as well without the picture as with it. And here, taking this illustration, we come to Baptism, and in the commission Jesus says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" and "repent and be baptized, every one of you," or, let each one of you already repentant be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. Here, he says, it is emblematic. I want to know whether baptism, as presented here by the Saviour, is necessary to the existence and enjoyment of the thing that it represents. If he says it is not, then we are prepared to meet him on that point. If he says it is, then he gives up the question, and admits that his illustration of the picture of the man is a sophism, and nothing else. We present this point, and ask the gentleman to give it his attention, whether it be necessary to the existence of the thing that it represents, or to the enjoyment of that thing of which it is an emblem. If it is not necessary, then, we say, we are ready to meet him. If he says it is, then he gives up the question. Our argument stands incontrovertibly fixed before your minds, and in regard to this passage in the Acts of the Apostles we want to call your attention to a few Baptist authorities, to show that they understand this passage precisely as we do; and we quote these Baptist authorities because we regard them as more authoritative with my friend and to the Baptists than authorities from any other quarter. We quote them because they are Baptists, that Baptists may see the position that leading men in their church have taken upon the subject that my friend so zealously wars against, and calls by such ugly names.

Now, we invite your attention to what is said, here, by Dr. Gale. We quote from Dr. Gale's seventh sermon on baptism, pages 193 and 199: "Such as seriously consider these things essential can never prevail with themselves to neglect so useful and necessary an ordinance, for it must appear very bold

and hard." Now, that is what Dr. Gale says to my friend. It is not my language to him, but Dr. Gale's, the Baptist brother that wrote a work on the subject of baptism. He is talking now to my friend, and to all of you, and says that it must appear very bold and hard for any to accept and promise themselves with the remission of their sins in any other way than the Scriptures direct. The Scriptures say that Christ instituted baptism for the remission of sins, and several persons in the Scriptures, and among the rest even the great apostle Paul, are commanded to be baptized in order to the remission of their sins. This is what Dr. Gale understands in reference to *eisaphesin amartion*, for the remission of sins. Here we have a number of passages from Mr. McClane, another Baptist authority of high standing in his church, and this is the language of Mr. McClane, a high authority in his church: "Be baptized for the remission, washing away of sins, evidently imports that in baptism the remission of sins is represented as really conferred upon the believer." We might go on. We have a number of passages here of the same nature, that we would quote had we time; but one more must close what we have to say upon the subject under discussion. We promised you some extracts from Dr. Lynd, a man well known by one of our worthy Moderators, who was at one time his student. We now call your attention to what he says. He was connected with the Bible Revision Association. Says Dr. Lynd: "We must not shrink from the admission because we may be charged with making too much of baptism—the Saviour and his apostles made much of baptism." Again, on the same page: "The apostles represent it as a burial and resurrection with Christ, as a putting on of Christ."—Lynd's work on Baptism, p. 6. And, further: "Baptism is a course necessary to a result, remission of sins in the same sense, that is a necessity arising from the command of God."—p. 7. And, again: "We may ask with perfect propriety, can a man be saved without

baptism, in the sense in which baptism is required of him?" p. 9. "When we believe in Jesus as our Lord, we put ourselves under his government in the way which he has appointed, that is, by baptism. No saving faith can be exercised independently of the subjection in the case in which it is required. No part of the New Testament warrants a man in accepting salvation who does not come in subjection to the government of Jesus Christ in the way which he has appointed, God granting him life and opportunity to put on Christ." pp. 14, 15. "Throughout this essay, when we speak of a sinner's justification by faith, we mean this kind of faith."—p. 15. "There is a connection between baptism and salvation, of which we have yet to speak."—p. 19. "This form of subjection to Christ is an inherent"—Dr. Lynd said so, and we quote it—"this form of subjection to Christ is an inherent element of the faith that justifies; hence, without it no true faith exists in the soul which does not render it, life and opportunity being granted."—p. 21. "Christ has commanded us to demonstrate our faith in his death for our offenses by baptism, with the assurance that he who believes and is baptized shall be saved, though there is nothing in baptism that renders it meritorious but by an external act demonstrative of the faith within."—pp. 24, 25. "Another design of this ordinance is that in this act we should take the oath of allegiance to Jesus Christ to be a subject. We are required in this ordinance to put on Christ."—p. 25. "We then publicly renounce our former life, and profess to commence a new life. We assert to the world in this act that we die to sin and rise to a new life."—p. 26. "Jesus Christ does not regard us as saved if we refuse to be baptized into the name of the Sacred Trinity."—p. 26. "This subjection in baptism to Jesus Christ is necessary to the very existence of faith itself, for it is an element of faith," so Dr. Lynd affirms.—p. 26. "Thus giving ourselves to the Lord and not to his people, which we afterward do when we

unite with them in a church capacity."—Lynd, p. 27. "To become members of the church, we must first be formally recognized by Jesus Christ as He spoke of His spiritual kingdom in the ordinance of baptism. In the primitive times Baptist believers were added to the church, and it is said the Lord added to the church daily the saved, not such as should be saved. Baptism has a much more important design than that of being a door into a Christian congregation."—p. 28. "It is very certain that the promise of salvation is to those who believe and are baptized. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' This is God's Word. Let those who do not thus put on Christ have all the trouble of meeting and explaining away the force of our Saviour's words. Let their consciences meet it fully."—p. 37. "We can never get clear of the connection which Christ has established. We can never repudiate the fact that salvation is promised to him who believes and is baptized."—p. 40. "An attempt has been made to show in what sense baptism is necessary to salvation. We may have failed in exhibiting this accurately, but the fact still remains."—p. 40. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S TENTH REPLY.

Brother Moderators, Respected Audience:—I have heard the reading from Dr. Lucas three times. It is in his lesson, and of course he has to go through with it. But the Dr. talks about "Ray's little book." Now, I have not been boasting about its being a large one, or either of them. I will state now, however, in regard to my works, that the man does not live who has ever proved the positions therein taken to be false. The Text-Book has gone through the sixth edition, and the Succession the fifth. Nearly twenty thousand dollars worth of them have been sold. It is a good deal easier for a man to sneer at things than to meet solid arguments.

But he says that several have been received among Baptists without an experience of grace. I just simply do not believe it. I think you are misinformed. I believe they confessed conversion, or they were not received among Baptists. I think you are mistaken in regard to it. If you can find one that was received among Baptists that does not profess to have an experience of grace in his heart, I think they ought to turn him out very soon.

Then, in regard to what I have said, that I do not regard his brethren as having been baptized. I reaffirm the same thing. I do not regard their administrations as valid baptism; I have always showed my faith by my works. In regard to communion with those who are not baptized, I will state that one inconsistency does not license another; and, therefore, let us be consistent. If we have done wrong at one time, let us just merely do so no more.

But, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Lard said this and the other about these matters. Well, dear friends, Mr. Campbell is the founder of the church that the gentleman is trying to defend as the church of Christ; and the reason I am talking about Mr. Campbell so much, is that I am going to the *head* of the gentleman's church. I am going to the law-giver in his church, without which Dr. Lucas could not have been saved, according to his own doctrine, or proposition. As his church had no connection with the Apostolic Church, and the Dr. admits that the Apostolic Church became extinct, and reappeared in the one that has been set up lately, in modern times, I must, therefore, go to the head and founder of his church, to look at the doctrines of his church. I will give you the views of Dr. Rice now. This is another man—not Campbell and Lard—I will give you a little variety now, Doctor. Page 38 of Mr. Rice's book on Campbellism: "Mr. Campbell's reformation commenced by assailing *truth and righteousness*, and by favoring and inculcating *destructive error*. It bitterly attacked the ministers of Christ, and heaped upon them multiplied slanders." Page 39, he says: "The Campbellite body is 'a mixed multitude,' whose faith can not be ascertained, or rather which has no particular faith; without organization, or order; overrun with every sort of doctrine, preached by almost all sorts of men; without any tribunal or ecclesiastical authority by which it could be purged of error. In such a body there may be found truly pious people; but when the leading man denies the operation of the Holy Spirit in the human heart, and preaches baptismal justification, it is not to be expected that many such will find either edification or pleasant associations. Certainly, evangelical Christians and churches can not acknowledge such a body as a church of Jesus Christ." I read this, to show that many of the greatest men that have ever had anything to do with *Campbellism* contend that it is not the church of the living God, and that, as

to their plan of salvation, it is not the plan advocated by Christ and the apostles.

But, the gentleman says that I said, in regard to Pentecost, that some persons were not required to be baptized, who were required to repent. I did not so state. I said that those two verbs were not connected together, in order to procure the same result, from the fact that they had different nominatives, were in different numbers, and in different persons—with different voices, and with different objects. "*Repent ye*, and *be baptized every one of you.*" Now, if I were to give my views of the rendering of it—and I do *not* profess to be a translator of the Word of God with infallible certainty—but this much I think I know, that literally rendered it would be, *repent ye, and let each one of you be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.* "Be baptized" is in the third person singular. As to the charge made about my copying from Brother Williams, I did so for this purpose: not that I had not learned that much myself, but I wished to give the weight of his authority, and of his influence, and his talents to my position. And this is why I often quote from others, when I have the same views. I am not so completely filled with vanity that I wish to put myself forward before all my brethren.

As to his making insinuations, I might make insinuations, too, about the Dr.'s want of information. I think he is a little off the rules we are to be governed by. I will next refer to what he said about *diatithemai.* He was going to settle the controversy, in regard to the commencement of the kingdom, on what Liddell and Scott said concerning the meaning of that word, that the first New Testament meaning was "to promise," and he was going to make it all depend there. But he did not bring up the proof. Liddell and Scott do not make *to promise* the first New Testament meaning of *diatithemai.* It means *to appoint.* The Dr. is mistaken. He has lost his whole cause on the setting up of the kingdom.

But, the examples he referred to as parallel to Acts ii. 38. He did not tell us, or the congregation, what was the result to be secured by the use of those examples he gave from the New Testament. My mind was called to another point. I was noting just at that time, and I did not gather the chapter, verse, or passage that he referred to. But I do not think he has examples precisely of the same sort, to procure the same result in those verbs. If he has, I wish him to define himself a little more particularly.

Now, in regard to Dr. Lynd, I will state, dear friends, that from what he read it appears that Dr. Lynd, while he used language a little stronger than I would indorse, aims to teach the doctrine that saving faith can not be exercised independently of a spirit of subjection to Christ. And when these converts become children of God, they will be baptized as the fruits of regeneration or conversion; that it is a subjective faith that brings one in subjection to Christ, and in baptism is the formal subjection to Christ. That is the language he read, that in baptism we have the formal subjection. Well, then, it is not the literal and real washing away of sins. And I will state this, from all I have seen, although I am not very familiar with Dr. Lynd's writings, I am prepared to advance the opinion that Dr. Lynd has nowhere taught the doctrine that baptism is absolutely essential to the pardon of sins. I do not believe that is the doctrine of Dr. Lynd; and I happen to have a work of Dr. Lynd, on Baptism, just now;—(p. 16) he comments thus: "Repent *every one of you*, and be baptized *every one of you.* They were to be immersed into the remission of sins, to symbolize the washing away of their sins through the atonement of Christ, and not that remission might follow that act." Here, is Dr. Lynd explaining himself—*not that remission might follow the act* of baptism, but they symbolize *the washing away of sins in baptism.* And, again (p. 18), he says: "The subjects of

this kingdom are those who are born of the Spirit of God. There is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus. How, then, can we baptize those who furnish no evidence of spiritual regeneration?" Showing that the *spiritual regeneration* has passed before baptism. That is the doctrine of Dr. Lynd, and if I had the works that he has quoted from, to examine the context, I will venture the assertion that his construction of Dr. Lynd's position is a little too strong.

But, another negative argument. The gentleman's church is not the church of Christ, *because it is not the martyr church* —that church which the *little horn* was said to have persecuted, and the members of which were *prevailed against* for 1260 years; and the true church was sorely persecuted by that scarlet woman, "drunken with the blood of the saints" and martyrs of Jesus. That martyr church comes along down the path of history. His church is not that church; but the church of Christ is the martyr church, the church of the New Testament, the church of the true and living God.

I wish to call your attention again to the fact, that it is not the true and genuine church of Christ, *because it is destitute of Bible repentance.* I will not attempt to read the passages just now, because I have not time, but I will make a condensed statement and refer you to the works and pages. *First*, then, the repentance of the gentleman's church is without the personal aid of the Holy Spirit.—Christian System, p. 64. *Second, it is without prayer.*—(Millennial Harbinger, extra, number 1, p. 35.) *Third, it is without godly sorrow.*—Christian System, p. 255. Repentance does not change the heart according to the teaching of the gentleman's church. It is without prayer and without the personal operation of the Spirit; and so Mr. Campbell says, "without godly sorrow." Such a repentance, we affirm, is not the repentance of the Bible: is not that repentance

taught in God's precious Word; because that repentance is wrought by a godly sorrow, working repentance into life, that deep penitence and sorrow that takes hold of the hearts of those who seek and serve God.

But I wish to call your attention to one more point. The Reformed Church, is not the true church of Christ, *because it does not possess that meek, peaceable and quiet spirit of the church of Christ*, I mean as an organization, I mean the leaders —those that have fabricated this system that they call the *reformation* of the nineteenth century. I need not refer to the insinuations that are continually heaped upon your unworthy servant throughout their press. I have this statement of Moses Lard in regard to myself from the Apostolic Times of 1869, Nov. 18: "The right way to deal with Ray, is to exhibit to the people, where he makes a noise, the meanness of his character, as shown by the contents of his books." He said I had written a bad book, but that he failed to point out a single paragraph or a single word that was not true; and yet he wants men to show "*the meanness of his character!*" Mr. Campbell said of the clergymen of his time: "That our principles would reduce hirelings, drones, idle shepherds, dumb dogs, and unfaithful watchmen to contempt, we allow."—Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, vol. 1, p. 244. Again, Mr. Campbell said, as found in the Life of Mr. John Smith (p. 15):

"The worshiping establishments now in operation throughout Christendom, increased and cemented by their respective voluminous confessions of faith, and their ecclesiastical constitutions, are not churches of Jesus Christ, but the legitimate daughters of that mother of harlots, the church of Rome." Showing what his estimate was of all other churches, and yet the disciples wish to commune with those daughters of the *old harlot*—that are not the Churches of Christ! Then, again, we have the testimony of Mr. Campbell, Millennial Harbinger, vol. 5, p. 195—"The opinion of the orthodox are about as

correct on millennial matters as they are on their systems of divinity. Their gigantic efforts to evangelize the world at the present is tending to perfect the analogy between the present and the past dispensation: compassing sea and land to make proselytes; and when they are made they are twofold more the children of hell." This shows that Mr. Campbell regarded those as proselytes—those that united with what is called the *orthodox* churches—as made twofold more the children of hell." And yet, if any one should use such strong language in argument against that system, then they are held up as uncharitable. I do not oppose his church because I have any antipathy against individual members. I do it as being truly in the service of my Master: to defend his truth against error—that error which is likely to destroy men. Hear what was said by Mr. Lard about Brother Williams. He says, in writing to one of the periodicals: "Allow me to warn all our brethren who love the truth against either buying or reading a certain cold, mean book, purported to have been written by one A. P. Williams, of Missouri. It is a sin to encourage the book, and no credit to any one to notice the man."—(Quoted from Modisett's work, p. 73.) Showing that from Mr. Campbell, the head and founder of the gentleman's church, down, they oftentimes resort to this mode of meeting men, and answering their works, they indulging in wholesale denunciations. And they have not manifested as much of that kindly spirit as the Saviour recommends.

But I will call your attention to the gentleman's arguments that he has presented (and I must dignify them with the term arguments). I wish you to remember that he affirmed that the church organization with which he, Dr. J. R. Lucas, stands identified, possesses the Bible characteristics, which entitles it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. He said they were right in regard to the commencement; that Pentecost was the time. But did he not contend

that the true church had become extinct? Then his church did not commence on the day of Pentecost, according to his own testimony. If it did not commence then, please tell us when it did commence. But the arguments I have advanced against his position, as to the setting up of the church, I do not think he has met any of them. He did not notice at all the passage which I cited from Acts x. 37, that "That word *I say*, ye know, which was published throughout all Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached"—preaching peace by Jesus Christ. Here is the testimony of Peter, at the house of Cornelius, that this word of salvation began from Galilee. And I showed from the letter to the Hebrews ii. 3, that this "great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him.*" Showing that Jesus Christ, not Peter, first preached this great salvation. Then, again, I showed that in Luke iv. 18-22, that this gospel that had been preached prophetically by Isaiah, was now fulfilled in the hearing, in the ears of those who were present, and I do not think he answered that argument. Then, *that* from the days of John, the Baptist, until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force; and then, Matthew xxiii. 13—where it is said the Pharisees *shut up the kingdom* against men; they would not go in themselves, and would not suffer those who were entering to go in; and, again, Luke xvi. 16—where it is said they pressed into the kingdom; from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven is pressed into; and the law and the prophets were until John. But the gentleman has not, it seems to me, fully answered these arguments. He said, although it was pressed into from the days of John, it meant the future—that it was going to be pressed into. In the other discussion, he said they pressed toward it. If they pressed toward it, it must have been in existence, or they could not

have pressed toward that kingdom. So it appears he has even failed in regard to the commencement of the true church. But, where did he find that his church commenced on the day of Pentecost? He was going to prove identity. It is bound to be the identical church set up on the day of Pentecost. If there was such an one set up on that day, it is still in existence; because all have learned from God's Word that the church never became extinct. In the second argument, the gentleman said they had the Bible foundation. I denied that, as an organization, they were founded on the Bible. I showed that Mr. Campbell presented what he called "a scheme of things," in what is called the *ancient gospel*, to be the *foundation* of that church, and that upon that he and his coworkers built what they call the *Millennial Church*. I showed that the Disciples did not operate on the plan of salvation administered by Christ, or by the prophets that Peter appealed to. I showed that they rejected the Lord's prayer from the New Testament, as not now being applicable. I showed that they rejected the plan of salvation administered by Christ, in the case of the thief upon the cross, and in the case of the publican; and of the palsied man; and in the case of the sinful woman, who bathed his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head; thus showing that they do not really take the Bible. But, I would like to call your attention for a moment to another position, showing that they claim a human production, one written by Mr. Campbell himself, as their fundamental work. Mr. Segar's Life of Alexander Campbell, page 26, says: "The arguments and details of these views are to be found in a work called the 'Christian System'—the fundamental work, so to speak, of the Disciples, as a religious people. The same views, especially, as regards baptism, are also amplified and discussed in another work, known as the 'Christian Baptist,' first published in serial form, and since revised, and collected as a sort of text-book

by the Disciples." This shows, that the *Christian System*, a work by Mr. Campbell, is their *fundamental* doctrinal work, and that the *Christian Baptist* is their text-book.

But, again, the Dr. claimed that they had the *Bible* form of church government, and *Bible officers*. This I denied, and called upon him for the proof. *I denied that non-preaching elders, administering the affairs of the church, were authorized in God's precious Word.* He has not opened his mouth upon that subject. He has not replied to it. I say, since that I have never heard a word upon it!

Again, he said Jesus Christ is their head, that they take him as the head of their church. I have shown from passage after passage that the Disciples do not regard Jesus Christ as their founder and head—I mean, their writers.

And, in regard to that Clay letter, Mr. *Richardson* says that Mr. Campbell had great favors shown to him while in England, and he mentions this very letter of Mr. Clay's that gave him such success in that country; and that letter says that *Dr. Campbell is the founder and the head of this religious community*, or denomination. And Dr. Segar, in the work I have quoted, said Mr. Campbell is the *recognized head of the new religious movement*, that had for its object the restoration of the original gospel and order of things; and that *out of this movement has grown* the gentleman's church. Thus, *Mr. Campbell is the founder, and Mr. Campbell is the head* of his church. Then, they are wrong in regard to their headship.

Again: He advanced in his line of argument, and said the Disciples were right because they had the right name, and he elaborated that question. But where does the gentleman find the name "*Christian* Church?" He has one more speech on the subject. Will he please tell us the chapter and verse? But, he says my questions are not relevant, and he is willing to let them go before the people unanswered! Whether relevant or not, when he has propounded questions I have made

an effort to answer those that concern the church. The question of debate is a church question. But, again, I ask him if the name "Christian" is ever found in connection with "church" in God's Word. If his argument is good for anything, it will prove that all the various denominations professing Christianity are the visible churches, or kingdoms of Jesus Christ, because every one, at least in the sense in which the word Christian is authorized, claim to be "Christians." They all claim it—Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and all the rest. I wish to know whether he includes *Disciples.* The Reformers do not use the *name Christian* scarcely at all in the East. In Virginia they call themselves *Disciples.* Is the gentleman going to deny that they are part of the church, because they call themselves "Disciples?" Again: The Unitarians of the East call themselves a "Christian Society," and yet they deny the divinity of Jesus Christ. Is the gentleman going to take them into fellowship? And, then, the *Winebrennerians* call themselves the "Church of God." Are they a part of the gentleman's church? Is he in fellowship with them, because they have got the right name? It seems to me he has failed totally and absolutely upon the name.

But, he said he had the right theory of faith. I have quoted passage after passage from his brethren, and that is why I quoted from his writers—not merely to make the statement that they held thus and so, but to back up my statements from their ablest writers—that their faith is not the faith of God's precious Word. It is not that faith with the heart, that faith that works by love, and purifies the heart; because, if this were the case, they would have a man of pure heart, a man that had a good conscience before repentance, which is impossible. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' ELEVENTH ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I simply say that my friend is mistaken in regard to the giving up of the definition of διατίθημι. In regard to the meaning of the word, I have not the time to discuss that question now. It will be up again with his proposition, and will be just as relevant then as now, when you will hear me fully on that question. But before we proceed further, lest we forget it, we will consider the passage here in regard to the 3d of Galatians, just quoted, and will go a little further on that subject, concerning Abraham's faith. Now, then, in the closing part of this chapter, beginning with the 24th verse, Paul goes on to explain himself, where he says, "The law was our schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith, but after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster, for ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

Paul explains himself. That is all we have to say on that subject.

But as you have had Dr. Lynd before your minds, I wish to call your attention to another passage or two—though we have many passages from him and others, and with this we will have to dismiss this subject, as this is our closing address on this proposition.

We quote from Dr. Lynd's work, p. 47: "The expression 'for the remission of sins,' would, ordinarily, indicate the same as the words 'in order to the remission of sins.' Professor Hackett, of Newtown, who may be regarded as good

authority, has translated the passages, Acts ii. 28, by the words 'in order to.' In this he will probably be sustained by the most distinguished scholars."

That is what Dr. Lynd says. And this is Dr. Hackett's translation, one of the Bible Union translators or revisors. He translates this: "*in order to the remission of sins.*" And Dr. Hackett and Dr. Lynd are both members of the Baptist church.

There are a number of others besides, whom we would like to quote. We have a number from Newman Hall, and from Wayland, and from a number of others that we might mention, if we had time, who testify to the same thing, and they are all prominent members of the Baptist church.

So far as the gentleman's translation is concerned, we accept it. The translation is correct; but we say that he never can make his position go with that translation; he may try it until Gabriel blows his trump, and he can not do it. But we state further. We say there is but one subject of these verbs, and in the passages to which we have already referred, and also in Euripides, that there is but one subject, though we have the two verbs, the second person imperative and the third person imperative, the second person plural imperative and the third person singular. Notwithstanding we have these verbs connected here and addressed to the very same persons, yet, we say, they have but the one subject, because they are used with reference to the same class of persons precisely, and look to one grand result. The gentleman has not noticed the passage in Euripides, or the passage referred to in Corinthians.

But we must hasten on to our review. We notice another point or two of the gentleman, however, before we enter that review. "The law and the prophets were until John: since then the kingdom of God is preached." We allow this to stand as a representative of all those passages that he has quoted, and these passages speak of the kingdom of God as

though it were existing in the days of John. The gentleman said that the apostles were not called until after John was in prison, and Jesus never gave the disciples the kingdom until after he went away; that at the time he went away it was forty days after the resurrection of Jesus; and if the apostles were not called, which he claims was the foundation of the kingdom, until after John was imprisoned, and they received not the kingdom from the Son of God until he went away, it was forty days after his resurrection. Then his doctrine about the kingdom actually existing in the days of John is all a farce. There is nothing in it, according to his own showing, and the gentleman has surrendered all that he has said upon these passages in regard to the setting up of the kingdom as actually existing in the days of John. In his admissions upon this particular case, he has surrendered the whole thing, so far as the kingdom then existing is concerned.

Well, he says, in regard to receiving persons in the Baptist church without experience of grace in their hearts, that so far as that point is concerned, he positively denies. Well, who said so? The gentleman is constantly getting up before you false issues, and matters that nobody ever affirmed. What did we affirm? We affirmed that the Baptist Church received members of the Christian Church without demanding of them an experience before baptism, as is common with the Baptist Church, and without rebaptizing them. We said that, and we say it now. Let the Baptist Church of this place deny it through Dr. Ray, and we will prove it by as good a man as you have in your city; and let him deny that. That is what we say. Let him deny the question, if he dare! I know what I am talking about, and if it is denied, you will find out that I do know something about these matters.

But, he refers to Dr. Rice. It seems he has got tired, after having been reminded every now and then, of his reading from Campbell and Lard. I should like to have him read on

—read on! I hope he will! I want to hear him read on the subject, and I have no doubt all the audience are interested every time he tells them that he is going to read from Campbell and Lard, and Lard and Campbell. Let him read on: no objections at all—none under the broad heavens! We do not complain at it at all. But now he quotes from Dr. Rice. Who is he? He is another individual who joined in the warfare of writing books on Campbellism, and the gentleman quotes him along with Jeter, and Taylor, and Williams, and Dr. Ray. He quotes them to show something in regard to our people. Can not you find another man that has written against Campbellism, and quote him? You better bring them all in.

But we must advance with our review. The first argument in favor of our proposition, that the church to which we belong, known and recognized by my brethren as the Christian Church, possesses the characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ.

The first argument to which we called your attention was drawn from the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah, where it is said, "In the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the tops of the mountains," and so on. Then, "That the law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." And, in connection with these prophecies, we called your attention to Luke's record, that repentance and remission of sins shall be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And the language of Jesus, "Tarry in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." Then, on the first Pentecost, when the Spirit descended to qualify them to preach the gospel of our blessed Lord, we have Peter affirming, "And this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel in the last days," and so on. And, in the very language of the prophecy of Isaiah, and of Micah, Jerusalem was the

place, the apostles were the persons to proclaim the name of Jesus, to preach the gospel; and they were endowed with the Spirit of God, and they began on the first Pentecost, after the ascension of our adorable Redeemer. The place and time—place, Jerusalem; and the time, the first Pentecost.

We quoted from Duncan; we quoted from Jones; we quoted from Orchard—all Baptists—and from Neander; and they all say that there the first church was established, and became a model church of all churches formed from that in the land of Judea. From their own authorities, then, our point is admitted. We quoted a number of other passages with regard to the kingdom. We presented, secondly, our argument that we had the right foundation—that the primitive church was founded upon Jesus. And so with regard to the church with which we stand identified—founded upon Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God. We quoted the Scriptures in demonstration of this proposition: "Upon this *rock will I build my church.*" And, again: "There is no other foundation laid." "There is no other foundation," said Paul, as presented in the 3d chapter of 1st Corinthians, and 10th verse: "*No other foundation but Christ Jesus the Lord.*" And, again, 2d Ephesians, closing part of that chapter: "You are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets"—*Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.* We are identical with the primitive church, then, in regard to the foundation. But, then, in regard to the creed. The Word of God—the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; that was the creed of the primitive church, that is our creed, to the exclusion of all others. Again, the Christian name. We showed you that the name was given by divine appointment, and that it was a patronymic name, derived from Christ—that it was the name of the family of Christians, and, therefore, as that family was a church, it was the name of the church of Christ, and therefore is the Christian Church, or church of

Christ. But further upon this subject. To show you that this patronymic name is derived from Christ, we call your attention to the prophecy of Isaiah, 9th chapter and 6th verse: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and he shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the mighty God;" or, as McKnight and others have rendered it, "*father of the everlasting age*—the prince of peace." He is the father of the Christian age, or dispensation. The name is patronymic, derived from Him, the name of his family, the church, and therefore it is the name of His church; therefore we say, then, we have the Bible name Christian Church, of which Christ is the head. We affirm that we are correct with regard to the ordinances of the church; we are correct with regard to the theory and plan of conversion. This was our argument on the theory and plan of conversion. First, we stated that our faith was according to the Word of God. That faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. The gentleman did not deny this. Consequently, we affirm that our faith rests upon the Saviour, as the only Redeemer. We quoted John xx. 30, 31, in demonstration of the truth of this proposition—that we were to believe him to be the Son of God, and that through Him we obtain life. We also stated that the office of faith is first to receive Jesus; secondly, it has an influence upon the heart. By faith the heart is purified, the love of sin is destroyed. We believe with all the heart. By this faith the heart is purified—the love of sin destroyed, the love of holiness created in its stead, and the man ceases to practice sin because he ceases to love sin, and practices holiness because he loves holiness. By the office of faith a godly sorrow is wrought in the heart, and this godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation that needeth not to be repented of. That every penitent believer is required to be baptized into the death of Christ, and put on Christ—

to be baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—that this penitent believer is now purified by faith, and having repented of his sins and baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity—that he is baptized for the remission of his sins.

We called your attention in proof to the great commission—"Go preach the gospel to every creature; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And also, to Peter's language in Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," and we have shown you that *eis aphesin amartoon* is, "in order to the remission of sins," and admitted by the gentleman's own proof. We called your attention to the language found in John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." We called your attention to the 22d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where Ananias appears to Saul of Tarsus, and says: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." We called your attention to the 3d chapter of 1st Peter, where the apostle says: "The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us." We called your attention to all these Scriptures, in proof of the characteristics of the primitive church; and they are the characteristics of the church known by my brethren as the church of Christ—as the Christian Church, with which I stand identified. If these characteristics made up the church of Christ, in primitive times, the same characteristics can be no more and no less than the church of Christ at the present day. If they constituted the church of Christ then, they constitute the church of Christ now. They can not constitute anything else than this. And if they made a certain organization—a certain church in the days of Christ and the apostles—they make the same institution, the same organization now. Consequently, we have shown you by these character-

istics that we are the church of Christ; that we are that organization, that institution presented in the Word of God, established by the authority of Jesus, and presented by the inspired apostles of the Son of God.

We think, then, that we have established our proposition, with one other point that we now propose to submit—namely, this: That so far as the members of the church of Jesus Christ are concerned, we teach them now precisely as they were taught primitively. The apostle Peter, in the 1st chapter of his second letter, says: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge: And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." "For if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And he exhorts them to be diligent, to make their calling and election sure, by cultivating these virtues in their lives. And so we teach the church—the members of the church, to-day. We say when you have entered the church, though you have believed—though you have repented—though you have been buried with your Lord in baptism, you are not in heaven. You have received the remission of your past sins. You have been adopted into the church, or kingdom here, but if you desire to enjoy an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom, you must add to your faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, or love. But, not only do we say in the language of the Word of God, as the apostle said in primitive times, but, also, "Run with patience the race that is set before you, looking unto Jesus, who is the author and finisher of your faith." Again: "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds, that ye may

prove what is that good; that perfect and acceptable will of God." And, we say in the language of the Divine Saviour, "Be faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." And in the language of the last chapter of Revelations, the final amen of the Word of God, we say: "Blessed *are* they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city;" that if they are faithful in obedience to the authority of Jesus Christ, when time shall be no more—when the sun shall be blotted out, and the stars shall leap from their places, and when the heavens shall be rolled up as a scroll, and the elements of this home of man shall melt with fervent heat, and all things temporal shall be past and gone forever. And, we say to those who obey the commandments of God, that they shall then be permitted to put forth their hands and pluck the fruit of the ambrosial tree of life, and eat and live forever; that they shall be permitted to walk the golden pavements of the New Jerusalem, and enjoy the smiles of the living God, through the cycles of a never ending eternity.

And now we appeal to you, in closing up this proposition on the church of Jesus Christ. We submit this proposition before your minds, that things equal to the same thing are equal to one another. With this axiom before your minds, and with these characteristics of the church of Jesus Christ: first, with regard to the *time of its beginning;* second, with regard to the *place of its beginning;* and third, with regard to the persons by whom, under the authority of Jesus Christ, this church, or kingdom, was begun, viz: at Jerusalem, by the apostles, and on the first Pentecost, as admitted by Orchard, Duncan, and Jones, and other Baptist authorities, and proved by the Word of God; also, the foundation, the Christ; and the creed, the Word of God; the head of the church, Jesus; the name given by divine appointment, Christian; the ordinances—the Lord's Supper; baptism; the one immersion:

the officials of the church—the evangelists, the elders, and the deacons; the evangelists to gather into the fold of Christ; the elders, or bishops, to take the oversight of the flock; and the deacons to attend to the secular affairs of the church. These are the official characters of the church. The plan of conversion, embracing the faith, its office, its object, and its connection with obedience, as presented in the Word of God—of repentance, of baptism, as presented in the divine volume, and the instruction to the members of the church. If what we have presented from the Word of God, if this constituted the church of Jesus Christ primitively, I ask you, candidly and honestly, before God, what do these things mean and constitute now? I want you to stop and think seriously and candidly upon this question, if you can. These things, evidently from the Word of God, did make the church of Jesus Christ primitively, and these things are all in the organization of the church to-day to which I belong; and I ask you, what do they make now? Can they constitute anything less than the church of Jesus Christ? I am certain that when you come to think seriously and fully upon this subject, you will be constrained to say they constitute no less now than they constituted in primitive times the church of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

These arguments have been presented. I ask you to stop and think, and run back in your minds, and consider the answers that have been made to the arguments submitted. Think for a moment what arguments have been submitted, and what replies have been made to them. What with regard to the time of the beginning? While it is true my friend said that the law and the prophets were until John, but since then the kingdom of God is preached, and he has given up the argument upon that subject by admitting that the kingdom did not exist in the days of John, by asserting that it did not exist until it had its foundation, and the apostles

were the foundation. But they were not called until John was imprisoned, and Jesus gave them not the kingdom until he passed away.

Now, then, here is the argument that the gentleman furnishes with regard to the beginning of the kingdom of God. He virtually, in these admissions, surrenders to the truth of our first argument upon the question. But what with regard to the foundation? Well, has he shown that we were wrong, according to the Word of God, upon this subject? He has not. He has quoted here from Campbell, and from Lard, and has introduced the letter that Mr. Clay wrote out of friendship for Mr. Campbell, that Mr. Campbell never asked him for, that Mr. Campbell never expected; and yet, because Mr. Clay said that Mr. Campbell was the head of a respectable body of Christians, that therefore he must be that head, because Mr. Clay said so, and because Dr. Rice said this, that, and the other; because Jeter said this, that, and the other; and because Williams said this, that, and the other; and because Mr. Ray affirms and denies with a great deal of boldness and assurance. Why, the thing must be so! and, therefore, our proposition must be false.

This is the kind of logic, and the kind of argumentation that has been submitted for your consideration to show you that our position has been false, and is false. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S LAST REPLY.

BRETHREN, MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: I stand before you denying the proposition in the concluding speech. In regard to my friend's examples from the New Testament, I was not certain that I got the chapter and verses. If I have the proper ones, he is a little mistaken. The 14th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and 37th verse, only has one imperative, and then when he comes to the other passage, as found in the 16th and 13th, he finds four imperatives, all of the same construction, unless I am mistaken as to what he has referred to. But they are not connected together to produce or secure similar results to the one named. In regard to the authorities just mentioned before he sat down, as I did not quote what he said about Jones, Duncan and others, I will state that they were talking of the location of the first church at Jerusalem. And from all that he read they do not say it was set up on the day of Pentecost. They were talking of the church as a local body, while *we* are discussing the term *church* in the sense of *kingdom*.

But I read from Wayland, to whom the gentleman has referred (page 88), where he explains his views more fully in this connection: "The person baptized abjures the world and enters into covenant with God. He *was* an enemy to God by wicked works, he is now a child of God through faith in his Son; he was *dead in sin*, he is now *alive to God;* the Spirit of God dwells in his heart, and to that Spirit he professes to subject every thought and purpose, every motive and action.

This is what we suppose is meant to be symbolized in the ordinance of baptism, and hence the meaning of the expression, baptized *into the name of*, or *into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*" Thus showing that when we come to the context these authors do not sustain the gentleman's doctrine of baptismal salvation.

Again, he denies that Mr. Campbell ever showed his commendatory letters. Page 548, volume 2, Memoirs—here is what Richardson says about it: "Having received highly commendatory letters of introduction from Henry Clay and others, and being highly favored by the American minister, Mr. Bancroft, and other persons of influence, he enjoyed unusual facilities, and everything he wished to see was opened to him in the city and in the country." He says that through these commendatory letters, as well as the kindness of Mr. Bancroft, he obtained access to everything he wanted to see. And yet my friend denies that he used the letters. How could he get those facilities upon those commendations, if he did not use them?

Again, he refers to Galatians iii. 26: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." That explains the whole matter. We are *children of God by faith;* then baptism is simply *putting on*—a public profession. There is a great difference between a birth, and the putting on of the clothing of that one that is born. He loses his argument there.

But, Acts xxii. 16, *arise, brother Saul,* "and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He can not possibly suppose that Paul *literally washed his sins away.* Let me state here, concerning Dr. Lynd, quoting from Dr. Hackett, in regard to Acts ii. 38, that Dr. Hackett connects this as a parallel passage in meaning with Acts ii. 38. He says these things are symbolized and figurative in bap-

tism, and explains himself. But he does not support, or sustain the gentleman's doctrine *of no baptism, no salvation,* whatever may be his criticism on Acts ii. 38.

I shall now proceed to recapitulate. I wish you to distinctly get before your minds what the gentleman undertook to establish, what he undertook to prove. He set out to prove that the church organization, of which he himself is a member, *possesses the Bible characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ*—not simply to give his views of what the apostolic church was when it was set up, but the present organization: this one, that Dr. Lucas belongs to, is the one we are discussing. He has missed the question all the time. He might as well have been talking in regard to natural philosophy, or an eclipse of the moon, or some other theory, as far as his present church is concerned. He has not proved even that his brethren possess the characteristics that he mentioned, and several of them I emphatically deny, and have shown to the contrary. *Firstly.* He stated that they were the true church, because they had the right theory of commencement! Why does he not say that they commenced at the right place? He dare not say his church commenced on the day of Pentecost; but they hold the right theory of commencement!! As I referred to the Southern Confederacy, a statesman might have said, "We are the ancient Grecian empire, because we have the theory that the ancient Grecians held!!!" *No, sir! He must prove identity,* and it would have to be a continuation of the ancient Grecian empire. But his proposition fails, whatever may be true about the setting up of the church. He made a statement that is not exactly correct: it was a little mistake. At the very close, almost, of his argument, he said I "admitted that the kingdom did not commence in the days of John." I never admitted any such thing—never in my life. I know what I admitted, and the report will show I

said that, as an organization, it was not established until after John was put in prison; and it is admitted John was in prison, some say a year and six months; and the Saviour called the apostles and began the organization in the days of John, while John was in prison. Then, "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time—(I did not say, since the beginning of John's preaching—since the days of John)—the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." It is very hard for the Dr. to understand my argument; and he has misconceived it all the time, and, therefore, wasted his time upon that point. As the report will show, I have shown that his church did not commence at the right time.

But, *secondly*, he made it as one of his arguments (and I have made it as one of my negatives, that it did not), that his church commenced at Jerusalem. I have proved from Mr. Segar, and from Mr. Moore, that the prime movers in that reformation which resulted in the creation of the gentleman's church were in America; that its head-center was at Bethany, Virginia, as far from Jerusalem as the broad expanse of the Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea—perhaps six thousand miles from the right place. Then, he is absolutely *lost* as to the place where the church of Christ first started, because he must prove that *his identical organization began at Jerusalem! He knows it did not.* Here, then, he is lost on the *second* characteristic.

Thirdly. It is not the church of Christ, or visible church, *because it has not the proper foundation.* Has he answered my argument upon this point? I showed that his church first began in America, and he has not opened his mouth in reply; nor has he denied the correctness of those historians who locate its beginning in Virginia. And if he was confuted in nothing else, this would prove that his church is not the one that Christ set up. *Again:* We showed that it was founded

on Mr. Campbell's *scheme of things*, not on Christ; and I have never found an author among his brethren that comes out just as he has, and said without addition or subtraction that the church is built on the Lord Jesus Christ as the foundation. They usually say, on Peter's *confession*, *statement*, or *proposition*, or Peter's faith, or something of that sort. He has lately become partially converted to the truth on this subject. I think he has been improved, because in the first discussion we had, he said it was upon *the truth of Peter's confession*, or upon Peter's confession.

MR. LUCAS—I did not say it, sir.

MR. RAY—But, then, he is learning better in regard to the subject.

MR. LUCAS—I did not say it. I rise to a question of order. He is introducing new matter, and I say I did not say it.

MR. RAY—I introduced the statement before, I think.

MR. LUCAS—I rise to a question of order. No, sir; you did not. I understand these little maneuvers in last speeches.

MR. RAY—As he has made a contradiction, and I have it in my notes, I know he said it, and I know he *forgot* about what the brother said in his prayer.

MR. LUCAS—I know I did not say it.

PRESIDENT SMITH (one of the Moderators)—I will just call the gentleman to order. It is my understanding, and my recollection, and also President Cook's recollection, that this matter has not been introduced before, with reference to the Blandinville debate, with reference to the confession—that particular point.

MR. RAY—I know I made that point in the discussion. Whether I referred to what he said at either place, I won't say.

PRESIDENT COOK (one of the Moderators)—The gentlemen have been referring to each of the debates previous to this, in regard to one thing and another; but as I have paid

very little attention to these incidental references which have been made, I can not say whether the subject has been introduced before this or not.

MR. RAY—I know the point has been introduced frequently, and the report will show that it is in regard to the confession, and I stated that—

MR. LUCAS—You have stated several times in this discussion what the position of Franklin and others was; that it was founded on the confession, but you have not referred to the Blandinville debate, or any other debate, that I said it was founded on the confession, for I never said so; for I never believed it in that sense in which you use it; and, therefore, I know I never said it in the Blandinville debate, or any other debate.

MR. RAY—Just let it pass then. I shall prove what I said as several took it down, and it will be proved hereafter. I hope my time, taken up in this manner, will not be taken out of my reply.*

MR. LUCAS—Give him all the time he wants.

MR. RAY—I *sympathize* very much with the Dr., but, then, his doctrine is wrong, and I can not spare that. It is not the church of the living God, because it has not the Bible foundation; and I showed from Mr. Campbell that his *scheme of things*, which he called the *ancient gospel*, was the *foundation* of his church; and I read here a quotation showing that one of their prominent historians, Mr. Segar, regarded the Christian System as their *fundamental* doctrinal work. Did he deny it? Did he refer to it? Not one word.

AGAIN, *fourthly*, it is not in the church of the living God, *because it inverts the order of God's commandments—repentance, faith, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, at his table in his kingdom.* To this time the Dr. has not replied to that argument. He

* *In the Blandinville debate, Dr. Lucas explained the language of Jesus to Peter thus:* "On the confession that you have made," "will I build my church."—D. B. RAY.

passed it by as silent as the grave! I proved from my friend's own authors that they inverted God's plan of salvation, and God's ordinances. Jesus preached *repentance and faith.* Paul *testified to the Jews and Greeks*—REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, AND FAITH TOWARD OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. *But the Dr. passed it by! He failed to reply.* It is not the church of the living God.

Then, *fifthly*, it is not the church of God—the visible kingdom, *because it is defective in its government and officers*, and when we called upon the Dr. to give Bible authority for having two classes, preaching and lay elders, he failed to do so. And when we called on him for the authority for taking the discipline out of the hands of the membership of the church and placing in that class of elders, he was as silent as the tomb. He did not open his mouth in regard to the argument. He simply said, "we have the Bible officers," and, therefore, we must take the testimony of Dr. Lucas, without proof. His testimony, however, is not altogether good without proof.

Sixthly, it is not the church of Jesus Christ, because it denies the personal work of the Holy Spirit in conversion. Did any one ever repent of his sins and become a child of God, without the personal aid of the Holy Spirit? I referred him to the fact, that in the conversion of Lydia the Lord *opened her heart;* that she attended to the things that were spoken of Paul, but the Dr. cared not to *open his mouth* on the subject. He *forgot* and failed to answer one word upon that subject, and he has not done so in any former discussion!

And, *seventhly*, my friend's church is not the church of the living God, *because it is a bundle of contradictions.* It admits of such a diversity of views—just to believe *one* fact, and submit to *one* act immersion—and thus harboring almost all the errors of fifteen centuries. Whether Unitarianism or Universalism; whether denying the resurrection of infants, or

teaching the doctrine of annihilation, they can all find a home in the gentleman's church. Mr. Campbell confesses *that all sorts of doctrine is preached, by nearly all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners, and with the supposed sanction of the reformation.* I say, then, with such a multitude of errors and contradictory doctrines, it is not the church of the living God.

And, *eighthly*, it is not the church of Christ, *because it is not the martyr church.* The true church of the living God suffered martyrdom—I mean, in its members—by the thousands and tens of thousands. The members of his church have never suffered martyrdom—not one. As far as is known to me, not one drop of martyr blood has ever been spilled in defense of the church of which the gentleman is the representative to-night.

But, *ninthly*, his is not the church of Christ, *because it holds the Popish error of church salvation, that out of the church there is no salvation.* This I proved from Lipscomb, and from other authors, that out of the church no man can be saved, and that the church has power to give *eternal life* to all its members. This is an error, because there is only one name given in heaven or among men whereby we must be saved.

Tenthly. I showed it is not the true church of Christ, *because they introduce improper materials into their organization.* They propose to take in one who is a sinner: I mean by that, to baptize sinners in order that they may become Christians; they baptize one who is a *child of Satan*, one who has not become reconciled to God! This is one of my arguments the gentleman passed over in silence. *He forgot to meet it!!* It is not the church of Christ on this account.

And, *eleventhly, it holds the fearful error of baptismal salvation, that without baptism there is no pardon of sins*—there is no new birth. It is true they contradict themselves, and say that God will sometimes save men without baptism; and yet they say that baptism is essential to pardon! It is a little

on this side, and a little on that side. Men are saved in prison without baptism, and men are saved among the Pedobaptists, as children of God and brethren, without baptism. And yet baptism is essential to salvation! And, then, the heathen, where they have no ability to be baptized, are saved without baptism; and so it is a system of contradictions, and not authorized in the precious word of God.

Twelfthly. We have shown that in numberless instances, from the founder down, among the prominent writers, the Disciples manifest an unkindly spirit to those who examine their claims. They speak disparagingly of Baptists, who have the right to investigate the claims of every church, of every error, and every truth; to examine it, and to try it in the very crucible of God's word.

Thirteenthly. I have shown that it is not the true church of Christ, because it is *destitute of Bible repentance*, and it is destitute *of Bible faith.* I do not mean that there are none among them that ever repent. I do not mean that there are none that are God's children among them, in spite of the errors of the church. I believe there are some of God's children in that church, but yet they are not in the church of Christ. "Other sheep I have," said the Saviour, "which are not of this fold." There are some of God's children in Babylon, as he said, and, then, there are some not in Babylon that are God's children, and not in the church of the living God. And, as I have referred to his argument where he admitted, at least in effect, that if the succession is true, if the first church has been perpetuated up to the present time, then his argument has failed.

I have shown from his own writers, Tolbert Fanning, Isaac Errett, Moses Lard, Benj. Franklin, and Alexander Campbell, that the church has stood to the present time. I add to this testimony David Lipscomb; and they all say that it has stood 1800 years to the present time.

As the gentleman belongs to a church of the present century, formed under the auspices of Alexander Campbell, it is not the church of Christ. I believe the Dr., without intending it, has admitted the *succession* at last. He affirmed that God has always had a people in Babylon, but they are not the visible church. This he affirmed in two former discussions. He affirmed that out of the kingdom of Christ there is no remission of sins. Then those people of God whose sins were remitted, were in the kingdom of Christ, and as God's people have continued from the time of Christ down to the present time, and as none out of the kingdom can be God's people, then the kingdom has stood; and as the society that he represents has not stood, but commenced in the present century, about forty-six years ago, then it is not the Church of Christ, according to his own admissions—according to his own arguments. But how did he meet the arguments in regard to the perpetuity of the church, in regard to the succession—that the church had stood—when I called his attention to Luke i. 33, where the angel said to Mary that "*He* shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." *That kingdom was to stand* FOREVER, *that kingdom was to have* NO END; that kingdom, then, is somewhere, that kingdom exists to-night as the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. That passage from Hebrews which says, "receiving a kingdom which *can not be moved*," that kingdom has not been shaken, that kingdom has not been moved.

And then from the prophecy of Daniel, where it is said the *God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall not be destroyed, shall not be left to other people; it shall break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms, and it shall stand* FOREVER. That kingdom is still standing, that kingdom is to stand through the coming ages.

It has been the martyr church long before the voice of

Luther was heard at the Diet of Worms, long before Calvin emerged from the bosom of the Catholic church; and that kingdom was battling for the truth of God before Henry was divorced from his wife and married Anne Boleyn, and became the head of the British church; that kingdom rallied under the blood-stained banner of the cross, battling for the truth of God amid the frowning monarchies of old continental Europe, while from the seven-hilled city, that triple-crowned tyrant fulminated his anathemas against the world, and sent out crusading armies to break the succession and destroy the church of the living God; and yet it stands, and has stood.

Men have tried with fire and faggots to destroy it, the devil has used all his ingenuity to overthrow that kingdom, wicked men have opposed it, and sectarians have attempted to set it aside, *yet that kingdom stands.* I thank God for the prospect, that at last in that good time that my friend talks about so eloquently, when at last the stars of heaven shall fall, and the moon grow pale and turn to blood, and Christ shall come, the bride will not be a *reformed church*, it will be the same identical kingdom, the church of the living God—that bride—the Lamb's wife that has borne on her bosom the emblems of the dying Saviour in the Lord's supper, and the token and remembrance of his resurrection in baptism.

It will be at the time that she will be caught up to meet the coming Saviour. Oh, for that glorious day when the triumph of the church shall come. It will not be a *man-made* church, not one of only thirty or forty years' existence, but *the church, the bride, the Lamb's wife*, that was hid in the wilderness, where she was preserved, surrounded by the mighty ramparts of those mountain fastnesses that God prepared for her when he made a home for his bride.

It will be the church of the living God that has stood all the time. There will be a time of triumph, there will be a

time of exultation, for though she has come through bloody seas, yet there will be a time to sing the song of triumph.

While others persecuted, she has persecuted no one, but has suffered for the cause of the Master. This is the church of which Jesus said, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" this is the church concerning which he said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Brethren, when you take away from me that truth of God's word, and say that his promise has failed—*his kingdom has had an end*—then I must fold up this old Jerusalem sword, that sword of the spirit, this Bible that the church has ever loved more than all else on earth. It is the word of God that calls me to labor on, to toil for that cause and for that kingdom; but if the Saviour's word has failed, and that kingdom has been prevailed against, if that church has ever come to an end, if there has ever been an hour since it was first set up when there was no church, then the church of the living God has ceased to exist, and there is not a witness for the church of God, not one voice in all the world.

Darkness, black as Egypt, the type of eternal night, will settle on our earth. No church of Jesus Christ on earth! I say, if you make me believe that, I must deny the word of God, and become a skeptic—I must become an infidel. *But,* NO! *let yonder heavens first pass away with a great noise, let the elements take fire and be consumed with fervent heat, yet God's word will stand. If history was a total blank, except the prophetic word—except the inspired word—if all the past was blotted out, and there was not one line left to mark the footprints of the church of the living God, I would plant myself on the* ETERNAL TRUTH OF GOD, *and I would stand against all skepticism and the powers of hell itself, and I would say,* THE CHURCH HAS STOOD TO THE PRESENT TIME. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Fifth Evening.

ELDER RAY'S OPENING ADDRESS.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

HON. JOHN M. GLOVER, PRESIDENT MODERATOR: The proposition for discussion to-night is the following: "The church organization with which I (D. B. Ray) stand identified, known by my brethren as the Baptist Church, possesses the Bible characteristics, which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ." D. B. Ray, affirming; J. R. Lucas, denying.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE: I appear in your presence at the present time in support of the proposition read in your hearing, that the Baptists, with whom I stand identified, possess the Bible characteristics which entitle them to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ.

The great mass of religionists, outside of the pale of the Baptist Church, seem to be at a loss to understand Baptist doctrine and Baptist history. Like some of olden time, when the question was propounded concerning the baptism of John, whether from heaven, or of men, they said: "We can not tell." I have the happiness, the honor, shall I say, of being identified with the largest religious community upon this continent, outside the church of Rome—I mean of those who count adult

membership—numbering largely on to two millions. While some are disposed not to know, or to understand our denominational character and standing in society, I will state, that from the statistical reports for the present year it appears we have about one hundred colleges, universities, and high schools, including theological schools, in the United States alone; some six, I believe, in Great Britain, and one in the city of Rome. And throughout every land and every country upon earth, our churches and our membership are contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. I say, with but little exception, they extend around this earthly ball—in the South Sea Islands, in the old world, in continental Europe, in Germany, Italy, Austria, Poland, Sweden—they are found throughout the entire land. We have in America, I believe, about fifty religious periodicals, and the largest Sunday school interest of any denomination in America. We number nearly twenty thousand ministers, and a membership by the million—taking all together upon the earth—who are contending for the truth of the living God. I wish, before I proceed to define more particularly the characteristics of the Baptists, to call your attention more especially to the proposition. The word church is from the Greek word *ecclesia*. It, in the proposition, is not used in its primary sense. It is agreed upon all hands that the primary meaning of the word points out a *local assembly*, and, when used in classic Greek, simply had reference to a *congregation called out* for whatever purpose it may have been gathered, but when appropriated by the Saviour to indicate his followers—his disciples—he applied it to *his called out*—those who were separated and *called out* from the world. It is most generally, or nearly altogether, used in the New Testament with reference to local assemblies; consequently, we have the "churches of Galatia," "the churches of Asia," and followers of the churches of God," etc. We believe, in some instances, however, that the term *church* is used out of its

primary sense—in the sense of kingdom—to embrace the entire membership of all the local churches. I find in one of the late editions of the new translation by the Bible Union—a translation of Acts ix. 31, thus: "The church, therefore, throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria, had peace, being built up," etc., while in the old translation it is "churches." And I find this rendering sustained by the most critical authorities. Those who are best versed in the ancient manuscripts decide, *that church is the word used by the Holy Spirit* in this case. And in Mat. xvi. 18—so often referred to in this discussion—"Upon this rock I will build my church." We understand the term *church* to be used here in that larger sense—not simply confined to a local congregation—because that congregation did not always remain in Jerusalem; it was dispersed and scattered, and yet he was to be with that church to the end of the world. I will say, however, I suppose there will be no dispute between myself and my worthy friend in regard to the use of the term "church" in the proposition, because he uses that word in the larger sense, as I do, in his proposition. I will here make a quotation, because I like, whenever I can, to strengthen my position by reference to the brethren, who have weight and influence. I will, therefore, read an extract in regard to the use of the terms church and kingdom: "We should feel obliged to any one who will produce one instance where the phrases 'the kingdom of Christ' and the 'church of Christ' refer to different institutions. A church of Christ differs from the church as a part differs from the whole, but we think that church and the kingdom of Christ refer to the self-same institution; and though they may never have been translated by the same phrase, it is no evidence they do not refer to the same organization. 'The kingdom of heaven' and the kingdom of God's dear Son, and the church of Christ, we also think refer to the self-same organism—the visible

churches, considered as one institution, under one headship." —*J. R. Graves, editor of the Baptist.*

This shows that he has this same view in regard to the use of the term *church* in the enlarged sense of *kingdom.* As regards the term *Baptist* in this proposition, I do not contend that the identical phrase *Baptist Church* is found in the New Testament, any more than the phrase *Christian Church*; but, as the name Baptist—*Baptistēs*—in the original was applied by divine authority to the first man authorized to administer baptism, and as baptism was left in the custody of the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they administer baptism, through their servants, they are *Baptist churches*, in the sense of administering baptism by church authority under Christ. Then, the use of the term Baptist contravenes no part of God's word. In fact, in this sense I understand that it has the Bible sanction, though the phrase *Baptist Church* is not found, just in those words, in the Scriptures. Then, when we use that term we do not build an argument upon the *name*, in order to sustain the validity of our claims, because names and nicknames may be applied to the very same institution. A man in America may be called by one name; he may go abroad, and from some circumstance his name may have become changed, or one name may have fallen into disuse, and he may be called by another name; but this would not prove that the man was a different man. Then, the identity of the church of the living God is not to be established by the name. Let me remark just here, that there is no authority, even in God's word, to contend *that any one denominational name was ever given to the church as an organization.* If it were so, my worthy friend would have found it. God's children have been called by various names, when considered in their relations to God, the Father, and Jesus Christ, or the plan of salvation. They are called *saints, disciples, sheep, brethren*, a great variety of names; but no denominational name is given.

I have called upon this intelligent audience, if such is the case, to point to the chapter and verse. Where is the denominational name by which the church is to be called, to the exclusion of all others?

But, in regard to the Baptists, the Baptists with whom we stand identified. As I have already remarked, they are found in all the civilized nations of the earth, and among the uncivilized, taking the lead by the advancement of "soul liberty." America owes largely her liberties to the Baptists of the days that are past. And even England herself owes a debt of gratitude to the Baptists for the enlarged liberties they enjoy, in breaking away from the former yoke of tyranny and oppression.

I wish to call the attention of the people again to the momentous and the responsible position we occupy this evening, in the light of God, angels, and dying men, in regard to the church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. But, before attempting to show that there is such an institution *now* upon the earth, let me say, dear friends, that there has never been but two divinely set up, or sanctioned, governments on earth. The first of these was the old Jewish theocracy, a political government, with many religious privileges, inaugurated under the direction and watchful care of the Almighty. Its constitution was brought down from the flaming summit of Sinai. Through succeeding generations that kingdom was a *shadow* of better things to come, and, in some respects, a type of that spiritual Israel, that church of the living God that should be set up in the last times. When the fulfillment of the prophecy came, that kingdom was set up. While, now, hundreds of churches or societies claim to represent that kingdom, and demand respect and consideration at the hands of an enlightened people, it is evident that they can not all be the veritable kingdom of Jesus Christ. But we have fallen upon times when every great *reformer*, every great man with

superior talents, feels fully authorized to inaugurate a reformation, or to set up a new organization. But if they could understand the divine pattern and plan of organization, and that God has called no man, or set of men, to perform this work, they certainly would not presume to attempt something for which God has never called them. Men, for ages past, have discussed, controverted, and fought over the dry bones of theological abstractions concerning the design of an ordinance, in regard to the "mode" and subjects of baptism, in regard to some of the points of doctrine; *but now the time has come for the battle of the churches, when we may stand up, man to man, and society to society, and contend for church or no church.* We ask, where is the kingdom of the living God? or, has God's word failed, and left the world in darkness, as regards the church of the Son of God?

But, in regard to who the Baptists are, I wish to call your attention to some authorities. I will read from the New American Cyclopedia (edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana; published by Appleton & Co., New York), from an article on "THE BAPTISTS." I do this because there are some people who have a poor conception of the Baptists. My worthy friend, in the previous discussion, seemed not to know the extent of the proposition he denied, and seemed utterly at a loss to understand it. I hope he has improved by this time, so that he will not be under the necessity of inquiring, "Who are the Baptists?" I call your attention to page 596 of the American Cyclopedia: "The Baptists, properly defined, are those who hold that the baptism of Christian believers is of universal obligation, and practice accordingly. And they hold this because they acknowledge no master but Christ; no rule of faith but his word; no baptism but that which is preceded and hallowed by personal piety; no church but that which is the body of Christ, pervaded, governed, and animated by his spirit. Whatever diversities

of opinion and usage are found among them, these are their common and characteristic principles; by these they are known and distinguished in every country, and in every age." I would remark, that the editors of this work are not Baptists, but they are men who are impartial, so far as these great questions are concerned; and if they have any partiality, it would not be in our favor. But, then, again: I call your attention to the next page, p. 597: "On the subject of church communion, the Baptists generally agree with other denominations, that it is not proper before baptism. As they find no exception to this rule in the New Testament, they do not feel authorized to invite those who are not, in their view, duly baptized, to unite with them at the Lord's table, however highly they esteem them. They profess in this limitation of church communion, that they do not judge the consciences of others, but seek to preserve their own. Open communion, so eloquently advocated by Robert Hall, in England, the Baptists of the United States regard as an anomaly. Yet, while holding these views, they claim to feel a cordial sympathy with other evangelical denominations, and rejoice to co-operate with them, as far as possible, in the work of Christ." And, then, again, on page 599, your attention is called to the following: "Their ministers preach the gospel freely, with a warm application to the conscience, and to the heart. No denomination is more characterized by experimental piety. The evidence of its possession is always required of candidates for baptism." And, again: "The Baptists, as will be evident from the above exposition of their principles, claim their origin from the ministry of Christ and his apostles." And this, I would remark, is the claim of Baptists generally. But, then, again: "They further claim that all the Christian churches of the first two centuries after Christ were founded and built up on the principles they profess; in proof of which they appeal to the high critical authorities in church history,

Mosheim, Neander, Hagenbach, Jacobi, and Bunsen. They further claim to be able to trace their history in a succession of pure churches (*cathari*), essentially Baptist, though under various names, from the third century down to the reformation. These churches, from the fifth century onward, were the subjects of systematic persecutions from the state churches, both in the East and in the West." Then, again: "In the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton, as reported by Whiston, 'the Baptists are the only body of Christians that has not symbolized with the Church of Rome.'"

I would like to emphasize that statement here, that that great man, Sir Isaac Newton, admits *that the Baptists are the only body of Christians that have never symbolized with the Church of Rome!* Again, on page 599: "Mr. Bancroft has summed up the matter in a few pregnant words: 'With greater consistency than Luther, they applied the doctrines of the reformation to the social positions of life, and threatened an end to priestcraft and kingcraft, spiritual dominion, titles, and vassalage. They were trodden under foot with foul reproaches and most arrogant scorn, and their history is written in the blood of thousands of the German peasantry; but their principles, secure in their immortality, escaped with Roger Williams to Providence, and his colony is witness that, naturally, the paths of the Baptists are the paths of freedom, pleasantness, and peace.'" And, again, on page 599: "Mr. Locke has truly said: 'The Baptists were from the beginning the friends of liberty; just and true liberty; equal and impartial liberty.'" Again, on the same page: "It was the share which the Baptists took, says Dr. Williams, in shoring up the fallen liberties of England, and in infusing new vigor and liberality into the Constitution of that country, that is not generally known; yet, to this body English liberty owes a debt it can never acknowledge. Among the Baptists Christian freedom found its earliest, its staunchest, its most consist-

ent, and its most disinterested champions." Again, page 600: Yet, "persecuted themselves, it is their glory never to have persecuted others." Again: "The article on religious liberty in the amendments to the American Constitution was introduced into it by the united efforts of the Baptists in 1789."

I might read many other extracts to show something of the influence of the Baptists, their principles, and their doctrine that has been advocated in the various parts of the world, through all ages.

Now, I proceed to call you to note the fact, that I am not contending about those little parties that some historians call minor sects among the Baptists. I will call the attention of my friend especially to the fact that in all the books concerning religious denominations, those with whom we are associated are simply called "BAPTISTS," without any other qualifying term. There are factions and little associations, some of whom have gone out from us, it is true, and some have been organized by others that had no sort of connection with us. They are usually called by some other name. For instance, those that are denominated *free will* Baptists, mainly in the East, were set up and organized by one Mr. Randall, I believe. They have never had any association with the great Baptist family. Thus, some historians class the gentleman's church among the Baptists, and call them "Campbellite Baptists!" When the Dr. talks of a great diversity of denominational names, they usually belong to the same class. Then, again, there are some that are called Dunkers, those that have never had any association with us. Then there are the Winebrennerians, calling themselves "the church of God," and the Swedenborgians, and so on. Then, there are some of the Antinomian brethren that broke off from the regular Baptist churches, or from the Baptists, about 1832. But I am here contending for the claims of THE BAPTISTS, and it will be developed in this discussion what the leading characteristics and

peculiarities of the *Baptists* are. All who hold and possess these doctrinal points, it matters not with me what they may be nicknamed, I would class as a part of the great Baptist family, identical with us in doctrine, even if they were nicknamed by something else.

Before I proceed to my first affirmative argument, I will simply state it, and call your attention to a mistake into which the world, or a large class, have unfortunately fallen. I state here, however, *that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics of the church of Christ, because they have the Bible succession* and hold the other peculiarities that characterize the true church of the living God. I simply call your attention just at this moment to the proof-texts introduced in the former propositions, showing to an infallible certainty that the kingdom of Christ has *no end.* It has the succession. It has been perpetuated. It has stood until the present time. But to return, a large class of persons have come to the conclusion, because of their want of information in regard to ancient church history, that the original kingdom of Christ, or church of the living God, became *apostate, became extinct,* and for long and dreary centuries there was no church of God in the world, and I believe my friend has taken that position, and denied the perpetuity of the church.

I have asked him to tell me at what period of the world's history the original church apostatized and became extinct, but he proposes not to answer, though discussing this very church question. He says it is not pertinent to the question! because when he answers he knows he is in a difficulty so deep that he will be buried. I ask him to tell this people where the church was revived, where the second church, the third, or fourth, if you please, was set up! But he dares not answer. The fearful error into which men have fallen is, that the church of Rome either is now or was once the true church of Christ, and that she became apostate, and consequently men

have set about the pious work of trying to *reform* that apostate church, to make the true church of Christ! I want to introduce the Scriptures now, to show that such is not the case, that the church of Rome is not now the church of Christ; that the church of Rome never was the church of Christ; and that the church of Rome never will be the church of Christ. I wish to call your attention to those passages upon which I suppose there will be no dispute. First, 2d Thessalonians—I will commence reading with the 3d verse, 2d chapter: "Let no man deceive you by any means, *for that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." God is not going to *reform* that mystery of iniquity, that false church, but he will consume it with the breath of his mouth, and *destroy* it by the brightness of his coming. "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs of lying wonders." The coming of this Romish apostasy, all commentators, I believe, agree, that this second chapter of 2d Thessalonians has reference to the church of Rome. "And *his coming* was after the *working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders.*" It can not be the true church, then, that came in such a way. But the tenth verse: "With all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." And, again, I call your attention

to Revelations xvii. 3-6: "So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." The original says with great *astonishment.* All Protestant commentators, including Scott, Newton and Clark, all, I believe, testify with one voice that this symbolical woman that was seated upon the scarlet beast represented the church of Rome, that false church that was soon to rise out of the pit; and when she first made her appearance on earth in prophetic vision, we see that woman drunken with the blood of the saints, reeling in her intoxication, riding the bloody beast and blaspheming the name of God, and with that awful name written upon her forehead! And what a fearful absurdity for any man in his senses to suppose that this sad, dark, fearful picture is the representative of the bride of Christ, the church of the living God. *No.* It is the false church.

And I wish your attention again to the fact that that church is not to be *reformed.* I read from the 18th chapter of Revelations, 1st to 4th verses: "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the

wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Thus showing that this Babylon, which was the same represented by that false woman, is to fall; that the world was to see the time when that Babylon was to become a den of thieves, and a voice from heaven cried—not to *reform her*—but "*Come out of her, my people, lest ye be partakers of her plagues.*" Where is the authority, then, for any man to claim this as once the true church? This was the grand mistake of Luther, of Calvin, of Melancthon, of Zwingli, and of Henry the VIII., when they undertook to *reform* that mighty and despotic power, the Church of Rome, which comes down to us dripping with the blood of fifty millions of the saints of God, and whose lips are foul with fiendish blasphemy; whose Pope has, in former ages, set his feet upon the necks of kings and emperors; who has crushed the world and filled the whole earth with superstition, idolatry, and ignorance; and yet, theologians (?) some of them, tell us that the Church of Rome was once the church of Christ!—that she was once the bride of the lamb of God! No: It is a slander, shall I say, upon the fair bride of Christ; it is a reproach upon the name of Jesus; it is a reproach upon the power of the living God, who said he would preserve his church unto the end. But I wish your attention to the fall of that false church—not to its *reformation*—Revelations xviii. 20, 21: "Rejoice over her, *thou* heaven, and *ye* holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her. And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great mill-stone, and cast *it* into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more." Notice this prophetic declaration. John was permitted at last to see

a mighty angel when he seized the mill-stone, and with fearful violence hurled it into the sea, and said: "Thus with violence shall Babylon be—reformed? no—*shall Babylon be destroyed.*

I learn, dear friends, that the smoke of her torment is to ascend up before God, forever and ever, and that she is to be burned with fire, and destroyed. I believe that fearful day of her trial is not very far in the future. And yet, I hear men, in their folly—wise men, and great men, and men well informed upon some subjects—who say that that old blasphemous, idolatrous Anti-christ was once the church of the living God!

Your attention is invited again, dear friends, to the testimony, or statements of God's word, in regard to the *perpetuity* of his church—and I want my friend particularly and categorically to notice every passage introduced—and if they do not teach the perpetuity of the church of the living God, I wish him to tell this people what they do teach. I press it upon him. I want your attention again to these prophetic Scriptures, Daniel ii. 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Also, Daniel ii. 35: "And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." That stone was the symbol that Nebuchadnezzar saw. Daniel interpreted the meaning of that stone, smiting the image and rolling on without any intermission, until that same little stone (first cut out of the mountain without hands) became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth, to be the kingdom of God. This is understood to be a prophecy concerning the kingdom of Christ, set up by Jesus Christ, the God of heaven. Please, Dr., will you tell me what that means; and please face that passage squarely, and tell me, does that have reference to the setting up of the

kingdom of Christ? If not, what does it mean? And when it says, "shall not be destroyed, does that mean *shall be destroyed?* When it says, "it shall stand forever," does "forever" mean a day or two, or a year or two, and then come to nothing? How will you meet the Universalist, when you say forever or endless has a limitation—it may come to an end in a few days or years? I say, dear friends, that unless endless is limited, that it must continue forever, co-eternal with God's throne itself, I do not believe that the bride—the church of Christ—will be destroyed. When Christ comes, I believe that she will be that grand city that John saw, descending from God out of heaven, in the last day, when caught up to meet the Lord in the air. That church will stand forever.

As previously quoted, 1st Tim. iii. 15: "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." And, then, in this connection, the passage in Micah iv. 1, and "it shall come to pass, *that* the mountain of the house of the LORD shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills." In that last day, which is yet unfulfilled—this part of that prediction—the same that Paul called the *Lord's house*—the pillar and ground of truth—that *Lord's house* becomes a great mountain, and shall be exalted in the top of the mountains. I wish the gentleman to take hold of these passages, and if that church has been destroyed, and become extinct, I wish him to introduce the proof, and not pass it by as he has been in the habit of doing.

But my friend introduced a Scripture heretofore, and tried to prove that the church become extinct, because the saints were persecuted for 1260 years; but, in Daniel vii. 27, we have the statement that "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High,

whose kingdom *is* an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Here, then, in the very chapter by which the gentleman attempted to prove that the kingdom became extinct, God says, *that kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.* The Dr. must prove that *everlasting* does not mean everlasting in this connection; that that kingdom is to have an end.

Again, Mat. xvi. 18: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." But the Dr.'s attempted criticism, saying, that "it" has reference to "rock"—foundation—fails, because I have shown, by at least half a dozen of the brightest lights in the gentleman's church, who have considered this subject, that "it" refers to "church." That church has stood until the present time, and the gates of hell shall not *prevail against the church.* It shall stand firmly is the voice of the prophecy. I wish him to take up every one of these passages and show, as he has not shown heretofore, and as he has not been able to show, that the succession of the church has been destroyed. Then, again, Mat. xxviii. 19, 20, where the Saviour said: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world." This is in connection with baptism. There is no baptism, I suppose, according to the gentleman's doctrine, disconnected with the kingdom of God—and this baptism must be perpetuated unto the end of the world, until the last Jesus is with his people. I ask him to set aside, if his doctrine is true, this plain and emphatic passage.

Luke i. 33: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." It shall stand forever. My friend's doctrine says that *it has had an end!* Here, then, is a direct contradiction between Dr. Lucas and the angel in reference to this matter—who declared, *that* "OF

HIS KINGDOM THERE SHALL BE NO END." Are we to put any confidence in God's word? Is there any certainty in interpretation? Are we to believe anything about it? And shall we explain away, and contradict, and dissect, and cut God's word into a thousand pieces, in order to establish a theory? Let theories go to the moles and bats.

Let us go to God's word and there we have this statement, Heb. xii. 28: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." He is talking about the time when the earthly things were shaking; and there is to be a time, he says, when the heavens are also to be shaken, but we have received a kingdom *that can not be shaken.* I believe that the language is a little stronger in the original than "can not be moved." Let us serve God with reverence and godly fear.

Here is another argument, drawn from 1st Cor. xi. 26: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, you do show the Lord's death till he come." As the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, only to be observed in church capacity, and it is to be observed till Christ comes the second time, therefore the church is to stand until he comes. There is no doubt about it. Here, then, are those arguments, eight in number, directly from God's precious word. I could as soon believe, dear friends, that the throne of God would topple from the heavens, or that the Saviour would fail to be the Son of God, as to believe that his word would fail. The heavens may pass away, and the elements may be consumed with fervent heat, yet God's word will stand, shall stand—stand forever. I have overwhelmed the gentleman, it seems to me, with the testimony of his own brethren. The succession stands: Mr. Campbell said so; Mr. Lard said so; Mr. Franklin said so; Mr. Lipscomb said so; and Tolbert Fanning said the same. All of the brightest lights his church

ever owned, all stand up and say, *that the church has stood the conflicts of* 1800 *years, and it stands now, and will stand until Christ shall come.* And shall the Dr. stand up here, in order to make way for his schemes, and do away with the precious word of the living God?

And here I draw a conclusion. I state, dear brethren, that those churches that trace their history through the Papal succession, from the Church of Rome, can not be that kingdom of God. It is impossible. It is known, and I say it in kindness, that all the branches of the Pedobaptist family have descended, either directly or remotely, from the Church of Rome. The *reformers* of the sixteenth century came out of the Church of Rome. Calvin was a member of the Catholic Church. Luther was a monk in the Catholic Church. Henry VIII. wrote a book in defense of the Catholic Church, and was styled the "Defender of the Faith." And so we find all these reformers, Melancthon, Zwingli, and others, all of them come directly out of the Catholic Church. Their reformation was a *reformation*, it is true, out of the Romish Church, and these Protestant churches have been branches which came out from them, coming down to the present time.

But, I state, that true succession belongs to that people, as Sir Isaac Newton has said, who have *never symbolized with the Church of Rome;* and, brethren, if one church, and there is no doubt about that, has that succession, it falls to the Baptists by inheritance. If every word of uninspired history was blotted out, if every line had been entirely destroyed, burned with the martyrs of the church, still it falls to the Baptists. Why? *Because we are the only people outside of Rome that has any succession, that makes any claim to succession.* I say, others only make that claim through the Church of Rome, and that being so, it falls to us, I remark again, by inheritance. No man has ever yet been able, and you may go to the most learned men of all that ever searched history, to tell where the Bap-

tists originated, unless they go back to the time of Christ. One says they originated with "John Menno," or Simon Menno. I asked a Romish priest, not long ago, in conversation. He did not know that I was a Baptist. He asked me several questions, and finally I asked him some. He could tell who founded the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Episcopal Church, the Lutherans, and so on. Said I to him, "Who set up the Baptist Church?" He hung his head in solemn silence for some time, and then said he, "I really do not know." And, dear brethren, I will state, that historians have no difficulty in locating the "*rise*" of every denomination, of every church on the earth, except the Baptists. We can go back and tell where the Church of Rome started; we can go back and tell where the British Church started; but, unless we go to Jesus Christ as the founder of what is called the "Baptist Church," that man does not live that has been able to point to any man as the *founder* and *head* of that church. I hope the gentleman will make a note of that, and tell me, if the Baptist Church was not founded by Jesus Christ, who set it up? where? and when? and in what country, what age, and in what time was it set up? I ask him to make a minute of it. He *forgets* these questions! I am ready to answer all questions pertinent to this question. When he asks me a fair question, I will try and answer it the best I can.

Another point I will introduce. If the Baptists fail to give a correct account of their own origin, they are the only church outside of Rome which is *too ignorant* or *too dishonest* to tell who is their founder. I go to the Methodists, and they will point to *John Wesley* as the founder of their church. I go to the gentleman's church, and his historians point to their leader, *Mr. Campbell, as their founder;* and so of other churches, each of which has some distinguished leader from whom they originated. But I go to the Baptists, and ask the Baptist historians, "who was your founder? where did this church origin-

ate?" and they will point to the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the fountain head.

In this connection I would like to read that passage that my friend commenced reading by mistake the other night, the very one he ought to have read, but it choked him so badly that he failed to be distinctly understood, and finally said somebody had turned up the pages, perhaps. Now, I will try and read it a little more distinctly, p. 796, Religious Encyclopedia: "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and, in latter times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long, in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. On this account, the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination, tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century, was in the highest degree necessary; and, at the same time, goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient." Here, then, we have the testimony of eminent men who have had access to the archives and libraries of old Europe, searching for years, and looking into the history of the church of the living God, standing up as candid men—learned Pedobaptists as they are—and saying that *"we have now seen that the Baptists, formerly called Anabaptists, and in latter times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles."* Here is the testimony, and I ask the gentleman to examine it and show its fallacy. If these great men were mistaken in saying that the Baptists are older than the old

Romish Church, let the gentleman demonstrate it. This he can not do, for before Rome mounted the throne of empire, before the conversion of Constantine, and the union of church and state in 312, before Theodosius and Honorius, emperors of the East and the West, issued their murderous edicts against the hated Baptists, *they, as the church of the living God, have stood.* No other church can put forth such a claim as this outside of old Rome, and her's is the Papal succession, that of the Anti-christ, the false church, the church of Satan; but our's is that of the church of Christ. [TIME EXPIRED.]

REPLY OF DR. LUCAS.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: My friend has said much in his speech to which you have just listened, that demands no reply from me. A very large portion of the speech seems to have been made upon the principle that he was debating with the Roman Catholic Church, and that the claims of the Catholic Church were up, and that he was discussing the claims of that church. But we have a different subject for discussion. It is not the claims of the Catholic Church, whether they are the church of Christ or not; but the question is in regard to the Baptist Church, with which my friend stands identified—that organization known by his brethren as the Baptist Church.

But I will state in the beginning, that if the gentleman's proposition be true, I want him to establish it beyond all controversy and doubt; for, certainly, we all desire the truth. I am just as anxious, if the proposition affirmed by my friend be true, that he should make it so appear as any other being now in the presence of God. I want him to establish it as true, for, as I have stated before, the motto, "*The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,*" is that which should interest our minds, that should govern and control our actions. The truth alone can do us good. By the truth we are made free, under the administration of the divine Saviour, and by the truth we shall be judged in the last and final day, when we shall receive our reward according to the standard of truth, and our actions in this life. Hence, we should enter upon this investigation realizing all these important facts.

We should labor to ascertain what the truth is, and what that institution is presented as the church of God.

The gentleman started out in his address by stating that the largest religious community on the continent, save the Catholic Church, is the Baptist Church. I suppose that he aimed to make the impression upon your minds that because it is the largest, and because it has quite a number of colleges, therefore it must be the church of Christ. I can not see what else the gentleman could have had in view in introducing this statemant. However, he admits that the Catholic Church is larger than his church, and, consequently, if he desired to make an impression upon your minds by the great numbers that are in the Baptist Church, and the large number of colleges which they have, and so on, that it must be the true church. If he desired to make this impression on your minds, the argument stands with just as great force in favor of the Catholic Church, because he admits that that church is larger than his. But this is a question that is not to be determined by majorities, it is not to be determined by numbers, but it is to be determined by the authority furnished in the word of God. The word of God must settle this question, or it will not be settled at all. But when we come to the real point, I doubt very much whether the gentleman does truly belong to the largest church upon the continent. I say, I doubt very much the truth of this statement. I have no doubt at all but that he thinks so, but I have great doubts with regard to the correctness of his thoughts upon the subject; and I wish to call your attention to a few little items here that I have gathered from the Religious Encyclopedia, in regard to the Baptists. Now, he states that the church he represents is simply the Baptist, without a qualifying term, and with all those churches of Baptists that have added the name, or the qualifying phrase by which they are distinguished from other organizations. He says that these

are parties that have gone off, but *his* church is simply Baptist, without the qualifying phrase; and this church, simply Baptist, without the qualifying or descriptive phrase, is the one that is embodied or embraced in his proposition. That is the inference that we have to draw from what he said. Well, in the Religious Encyclopedia, in the article entitled "Baptists," we find the following presented: First, the *Particular* Baptists. Here we have the Baptists with the qualifying term "particular." Well, he does not belong to that church, because his church has no qualifying phrase, but simply the "Baptist Church." The "Particular" Baptist Church, then, he does not belong to it, as this is one of the churches that he says has gone off, having this qualifying term "particular;" and I will venture, if his salvation depended upon it, he could not find the Baptist Church beyond that particular Baptist Church in history. Notwithstanding he has talked so much upon the subject of history, he can not, in his own authority there, in the Religious Encyclopedia, a Baptist work, from which he has read at length, he can not go back beyond the "Particular Baptists," if all heaven depended upon it.

But the first presented is the "Particular Baptists." Well, he does not belong to that church. That is not the church, according to his statement. The second is the "General Baptists." Here we have the word "general," as descriptive of the kind of Baptists referred to. These are not the Particular Baptists, but the General Baptists. Now, he does not belong to these, for his church is simply the Baptist Church. He does not belong to these—these are a sect that he says have gone off. Well, if they went off anywhere, they went off from the Particular Baptists, not from his Baptist Church, for his Baptist Church has no qualifying phrase—it is the Baptist Church. Well, he does not belong to the General Baptists. These are not the Baptists as embraced in his proposition, and that he has pledged himself to prove to this audience to be

the church of Christ. Well, General Baptists were divided into "the Old Connection"—the old connection of Baptists. Then we have here the old connection of Baptists, as qualifying the kind of Baptists referred to—the Old Connection of Baptists. Well, he does not belong to this church, for his church has no qualifying phrase. All those that have this qualifying phrase have gone off, he says, from the Baptist Church. Well, he does not belong to this church. Well, here we have three. The next is the "New Connection," the General Baptists, divided into the Old Connection and the New Connection. Well, he does not belong to this church, for his church has none of these qualifying phrases. He does not belong to the New Connection of Baptists; he belongs to something else, and hence this organization is not the one as embraced and embodied in his proposition. The fifth organization is the "Scotch Baptists." Well, he does not belong to that, that is not his church, that is not the church as embodied in his proposition, and consequently they are out of the great number to which he referred, and are not of the Baptist church, for all these with qualifying phrases are sectarian, and have gone out. But he belongs to the Baptist Church, not the Scotch Baptist church. He does not belong to that, that church is not the one embraced in his proposition, Well, Regular Baptists. The sixth is the "Regular Baptists." Well, here is the qualifying phrase "Regular," and according to his rule it is a sectarian establishment. It is not his Baptist church. That is not the one embraced in his proposition. Now, here we have the sixth Baptist Church out of his proposition. Well, the seventh—the "Seventh Day Baptists," and he says he does not belong to any of these, none of these constitute his church, his is simply the Baptist Church. He does not belong, then, to any of these. Well, we have the eighth Baptist Church, the Free-Will Baptists. He spoke of these, does not belong to these. He told us that he did not be-

long to the Free-Will Baptists, because these have the qualifying phrase to tell what kind of Baptists they are. They do not constitute the church embraced in his proposition. Well, the ninth church, "Missionary Baptists." He has gone back on what he said about these. He said at one time he belonged to the "Missionary Baptists," but now he says he belongs to the Baptist Church, not to any organization that has the qualifying phrase, for those are all sectarian, and have gone off from the true Baptists. Well, there is what some call the "Two Seed Baptists," known generally and familiarly in Kentucky as the Dudley Baptists, and they are called "Two Seed Baptists." Now here, again, we have a qualifying phrase, and he does not belong to these, these are not embraced in his proposition. Now here are ten Baptist churches that have a qualifying phrase by which they are described and distinguished, the one from the others, and he belongs not to any one of these. Well, now add up the numbers, will you, that belong to all these Baptist churches, that he says he does not belong to, and that his proposition does not embrace, and then, I think, instead of his Baptist Church being the largest on the continent, it will be a very small concern, his church will then be small indeed!

But now, if he says his people have a qualifying phrase by which their organization is distinguished from the others, and that his proposition does not embrace one of these organizations so described in the Religious Encycloyedia, a Baptist work; if he says his proposition embraces one of these organizations, I want him to tell us which one of these various sects here under the head of Baptists, these various parties, called Baptists—under these different descriptive terms; I wish him to tell this audience which one of these churches he belongs to, and which one of these churches he embraces in his proposition, and that is known by his brethren as the Baptist Church. I want him to tell this

audience which one it is, which one he embodies in his proposition, and that he affirms to possess the characteristics which entitle it to be called the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. This is especially important, from this fact, he proposes to identify the church by the chain of succession. And now he fixes the first link here—the church that he belongs to, known by his brethren, he says, as the Baptist Church—he fixes the first link of his succession here, and he goes back through the Mennonites to trace his chain of succession through the Mennonites. So with the different parties of the Mennonites; then, he will have to show which one of the parties among them possessed the characteristics of this Baptist Church, in order to get the link. He will have to do this, and then he must say that the Anabaptists possess the characteristics of his particular branch of the Mennonites, if they are identical with the true church; and when he comes to the Waldenses, then he must pick out his branch among the Waldenses, for they were divided; he must select his branch here, and show that this particular branch among the Waldenses possesses the characteristics of the Anabaptists, and that they possessed the characteristics of his particular branch of the Mennonites, and that they possessed the characteristics of his branch of the Baptist Church, showing the links step by step, and showing that all these possess the characteristics of the church of Christ. He must do this, or he fails, and his succession argument is not worth a single penny, unless he can do this.

I hope, therefore, he will make these matters perfectly plain to our minds. But, then, he quotes from Isaiah and Micah. First, however, before we notice these prophets, we want to notice several other points presented in the gentleman's speech. Stating, again, that many of these different Baptists—that they teach different doctrines, and that one organization of Baptists do not fraternize, or commune with the others; that

is to say, the Particular Baptists do not admit the Regular Baptists, or the General Baptists to their communion; they do not commune with the Generals, or the Regulars; they do not commune with the Old or New Connection, or with any of those other branches, or members of the Baptist Family. They do not commune with each other at the Lord's table; they stand here, especially, aloof from each other. But the name, he says, does not found anything. Well, it is very well for him that it does not. He does not found anything upon the name, for just as certain as he were to found an argument in favor of his church upon the name, it would be like the house built upon the sand—it would be washed away. For it can have no foundation in the word of God. "Baptist," every one knows that the word "Baptist" is simply a Greek word anglicised, and the Bible Union, when they had to translate the words, "In these days came John, baptizing and preaching in the wilderness"—the Bible Union Revision Association, or the Baptist Revision Association—this association furnished the gentleman with a translation of the word of God. They have translated this passage. How? Why, "In those days came John, the immerser, preaching in the wilderness." Consequently, in order to have the English name for his church, he must have the "immerser" church. That is its name in English, "Immerser Church," not the Baptist Church. Well, my friend, when this same difficulty was presented before, he spoke of the same difficulty so far as we are concerned, that Christ meant "anointed," and, therefore, it would be the "anointed church" as to the followers of Jesus Christ in English. We told him then that we would accept that, for that is just exactly what we contend, for in English the church is the anointed church of Jesus Christ; but he will not accept any English name for his church. It is an English church; that is, it is controlled and governed by the English language, and we are to speak of it to those who speak this

language, in the language that they have adopted, and by which they are governed; where this language is the medium of communication from one to the other, it should be called the immerser church. But the gentleman is not willing to do that. He calls it the Baptist Church, but, while he makes no argument upon the name, he seems to think that the name is a matter of very little importance after all. Well, now, I would like to know how any organization can be identified in law, as an independent organization, without a name, for the name is one of the characteristics that must belong to the individual or to the organization, in order to its identification. Every one must see that the name is important in order to the identification of the institution, or even of the individual, before the law and among men. The name is an important characteristic; it does not go to make up the whole character of the organization, but it is one of the characteristics of the identification by which that institution and personality may be established.

But, the Baptists have the Bible succession. Well, I ask you the authority for that. "Well, my friend, Mr. Ray, said so." But he has not identified his church with the church presented in the word of God yet. He has not shown that it posseses the characteristics of the church of Jesus Christ, and until he does this, how can he establish the fact that the Baptists have the Bible succession? Even grant that the doctrine of church succession is true, he must show that his church is identical with the church of Christ before he can establish the affirmation made by him, that the Baptist Church has the Bible succession. This proposition we deny, and for the present, in regard to the question of succession, as the gentleman relies more upon this than any other, we will simply call your attention to the statement and testimony of his Brother Benedict again, one of the greatest Baptist historians that has ever lived, giving the history of the Baptist

Church. He testifies what we have read in your hearing before. He says (p. 51, Succession of Churches): "I shall not attempt to trace a continuous line of churches, as we can for a few centuries past in Europe and America. This is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim." "To which we." I suppose he means by the "we" here, not only Benedict, but he means the Baptists with whom he stands identified. And now he states, take it either one way or the other, "This is a kind of succession to which *we* have never laid claim." Well, then, he must belong to a different class of Baptists than those to which my friend belongs. He certainly must belong to another Baptist Church, and hence he is defining and identifying his church so that we can understand which of the Baptists he belongs to, and that his proposition embraces, and of which he affirms so largely and so strongly. Now, "this is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim, and, of course, we make no effort to prove it, because we have never laid claim to it, and we place no kind of reliance on this sort of testimony to establish the soundness of our faith, or the validity of our administration." This is what Mr. Benedict says: "But the more I study," says he, "the subject, the stronger are my convictions that if all the facts of the case could be disclosed"—as a matter of course, he did not have the facts; he says, therefore, "if all the facts of the case could be disclosed, a very good succession could be made out." "If all the facts were disclosed"—but right here again is the difficulty—"*if* all the facts were disclosed." Now, he admits that they are not disclosed, and, therefore, those things that he speaks of as facts he has no knowledge of at all, if they have not been disclosed. Well, I would like to know by what authority a man can even intimate the existence of that of which he has no knowledge. I assert that he has transcended the true bounds of propriety in the case when he acknowledges the facts are not disclosed,

and, therefore, he knows them not. And if he knows them not, how does he know that they exist? And if such facts do exist, as a matter of course, he has no knowledge upon this question at all. But, even take the case; he says, "*if.*" As we have said before, that little word "if" is in the way. It is a very troublesome word. I simply remark, as I have stated before, if I had enough money I could start your rolling mill in a very short time. I could put it right through, if I had enough money. I could buy your town and your county, if I had enough money. But here is the trouble. I have not it; I have not the money; therefore, I can not do any of these things; and Mr. Benedict, as he has not the facts by which to establish the succession, can not do it. Well, that is a pretty good reason, and he should not be blamed for not establishing the succession, when he has not the facts upon which to establish it, or to found it, or to cause it to rest.

Now, we call your attention to the testimony of Robinson, and other eminent Baptists, introduced here by Benedict, and indorsed by him; consequently, it is not only the testimony of Robinson, but is the testimony, by introduction and indorsement, of Benedict himself; and hence we have, in regard to what Robinson here says, the testimony of Benedict and Robinson jointly. Now, then, he says, on pages 34 and 35, what is here affirmed; well, we read, beginning at the 34th page: "Protestants, by the most substantial arguments, have blasted the doctrine of Papal succession, and yet those very Protestants have undertaken to make proof of an unbroken series of persons of their sentiments following one another in due order from the apostles to themselves. The Papal succession is a catalogue of names of real and imaginary men, christians and atheists, blasphemers and saints. The Lutheran succession runs in the Papal channel till the Reformation, and then, in a small stream, changes its

course. The Calvinistic succession, which includes the presbyterian, and all sects which originated from Geneva, is a zigzag, and is made up of men of all beliefs and principles, and all communities, and, what is very surprising, of anabaptists —exactly such men as Calvin and his associates committed to the flames for heresy. The doctrine of uninterrupted succession is necessary only to such churches as regulate their faith and practice by tradition, and for their use it was first invented."

Now, he says, that the doctrine of uninterrupted succession is necessary only to such churches as regulate their faith and practice by tradition, and for their use it was first invented. We have read you passages similar from the "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge"—a Baptist authority—where the position is taken that there is but little, or nothing known of the history of the church for several hundred years, while, on the other hand, the history of the Anti-christ is very clear and full.

Now, with regard to succession, the Roman Catholic Church, upon this subject, I will venture to say, can make out at least as good a claim and as clear a succession as my worthy friend, and, I will say, much clearer; but, then, the gentleman says, none but the Baptist Church and the Roman Church claim a succession unbroken. Well, he forgot at the time, as a matter of course, the Greek Church. The Greek Church claim that they have an unbroken succession, and claim that they are older than the Catholic Church. You have read the history of the church; you go back to the third and fourth centuries, when they were having their contentions between the bishops—or even before that time—the Bishop of Antioch, and the Bishop of Rome, and the Bishop of Constantinople, and, finally, the co-operation of the Bishops of Antioch and Rome against the Bishop of Constantinople, when the Bishop of Constantinople separated from the Roman

Church, and the Greek Church brought into existence; from that time the Latin and the Greek churches have existed as independent churches, both claiming an unbroken succession back to the days of the apostles. And even the Episcopal Church claim a succession independent of these others. They claim that they can trace a succession to the days of the apostles. But my worthy friend has called our attention to several passages of Scripture, to passages that had been up, claiming our attention even before this, and he says, that he wants me to notice every single passage that he introduces. Now, suppose he introduces three affirming the same thing, and if I notice one of them and show that that passage does not teach what he makes it teach, is it necessary for me to notice all the three, when they affirm the same thing? If I show that one of the class does not teach what he says it teaches, then I have shown that they all three do not teach what he says they teach, as they all affirm the same thing.

But, with regard to the prophecy of Daniel ii. 44: "In the days of these kings"—the Roman Cæsars—"in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and it shall have no end." An argument is based upon the declaration that it shall have no end, that it shall not be destroyed. Well, now, I believe this passage as firmly as my friend, just as firmly as does he, but, at the same time, I believe that the church, the kingdom of Jesus Christ, the visible church and kingdom, is the church and kingdom embodied in our proposition: that the church or kingdom visible may be overturned and prevailed against, so that its history may be lost, just as Baptist authorities testify to be the case for several hundred years. Though it may be overcome and subdued for centuries, that is not the end of the kingdom—the kingdom is not finally overcome and destroyed—it will be resuscitated, it will be revived, and shall appear in the end glorious and powerful. I believe this, but, then, again,

I say that this overcoming, or prevailing, does not involve the idea of the end—of the final destruction of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Now, then, I give you an illustration: I say that a man dies, death overcomes him, and he is carried down into the dark empire of the tomb. Is that the end of that man? Death has triumphed over him, death has prevailed against him, and has carried him down into the grave. But my friend will not say that is the end of the man, and so we say that the gates of Hades may so prevail against the church that its visibly organized form can not be affirmed as existing, and yet it will not be the end of that institution any more than death is the end of man; and no one but he who adopts the language of Voltaire, that "death is an eternal sleep," affirms that this is the end of man, and so we meet all these passages. We affirm the same thing as regards the kingdom of Christ. But he notices Timothy again, iii. 15, where he speaks of the church as "the house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Now, when Paul speaks of the church here, or the house of God, he speaks of it as truly existing, as being actually then established by the authority of Jesus Christ.

But, my friend has quoted in connection with this passage again, Isaiah and Micah, and surely there is no point in the reference to these prophecies, in connection with the language of Paul, unless they refer to the same church and the same house that Paul affirmed as then having an actual existence; and yet, in the face of all this, he turns round and tells us that these prophecies do not refer to the church as now existing, or as having existed from the time of its establishment by the authority of Jesus Christ, but it refers to the final consummation and glorification of the church, and of all things connected with the church. But, then, he quotes Mat. xvi. 18: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now, there is a differ-

ence between my friend and myself, upon this passage, with regard to the antecedent of the pronoun "it." Here is the difficulty. He says, "church;" I say, "rock." There is a difference between my friend and myself. But whatever is here affirmed, it is said that the gates of Hades, the unseen world, or the gates of death, as some express it, that they shall not prevail against it. Well, now, we say that "it" can not refer to church, as you can not have the church without its members, and it is affirmed that the saints shall be prevailed against, as is affirmed in Daniel, chapter 7th, and as is affirmed in the book of Revelations, chapter 13th. It is said "The beast overcome the saints of God, that they made war against them and overcome them." This is affirmed both in Revelations and in the prophecy of Daniel, but my friend says individual saints, that with regard to individual saints this was true. Well, the gentleman has simply said a little more than the Scriptures affirm on the subject. They say "prevailed against the saints," "overcome the saints." It does not say "individual saints," or "particular saints," but says, "*overcome the saints;*" "*prevailed against the saints.*" These are the declarations, and we say that the antecedent of the pronoun here must be determined by other passages of Scripture, and as these passages speak of the saints being overcome and prevailed against, whatever is presented here as the antecedent of the pronoun, it is affirmed that against it the gates of hell, or Hades, shall not prevail. You can not have the church without the saints, or its members. The antecedent of the pronoun must, then, refer to "rock" and not to church; and, we state further, that, grammatically, "it" may refer either to the one or the other. So far as the grammar of the passage is concerned, "it" may have for its antecedent either "church" or "rock"—either one or the other; but, as before stated, the antecedent must be determined by other Scriptures, and we have introduced these Scriptures to show you

that it must refer to "rock," as the rock is that against which the gates of death have never prevailed—the rock Christ. The gates of hell have not prevailed against this foundation —this rock upon which the church is built and made to rest. We have noticed these passages presented by my friend, and we have shown that the idea as presented in them is not at all inconsistent with the truth as presented by us, and that while it is affirmed that the kingdom established shall not have an end—it shall not be destroyed, yet it may be prevailed against—it may be overcome; just as his Baptist authorities, with regard to the church, have affirmed: may be prevailed against, so far as to have no visible existence for hundreds of years. Yet that is not the end of the kingdom, or its destruction, any more than the death of a man, death prevailing against a man and triumphing over him, is the end of the man.

On his succession argument, we have referred you to his own Baptist authorities, and to what he said with regard to the Baptist Church, and we do hope that as his church possesses no qualifying, or descriptive phrase, and these others do—we do hope that he will give the characteristics of his church in such a way that we may know what church is embraced in his proposition.

Having noticed these things, we desire to call your attention to some arguments that we offer against the truth of the gentleman's proposition. The first argument we offer against the truth of the gentleman's proposition is this: He has affirmed that his church was established in the days of John the the Baptist. Whatever that church is that he calls the Baptist Church, he has asserted that it was established in the days of John the Baptist. Well, we state that it can not be the church of Christ from the very fact that the date of its beginning is wrong, is opposed to the teaching of the word of God, and is not that presented and revealed in the inspired Scriptures of God. We called your attention to this point in the discussion

of the former proposition, and much of the matter introduced then will necessarily come before your minds again in the discussion of this proposition. We called your attention to the Scriptures, and showed that they must exclude forever the idea that the church and kingdom of Jesus Christ was established in the days of John the Baptist, or was established even before the death of the Son of God. Now, one of the Scriptures to which we invited your attention is found in the Acts of the Apostles in the first chapter, beginning with the 6th verse. It is here stated: "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom of Israel?" This was their conception of his kingdom. Up to this time they had no true conception of his kingdom, and even thought he was to reign over a temporal kingdom in the world, and consequently they desired to ask of him the privilege, some of them, of sitting on his right hand and on his left, when he should rule and reign in his kingdom here. "And he said unto them, it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power, but ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." Now, here Jesus speaks of the kingdom as not having yet been established, just a few moments before he ascended to the Father, and this was at least forty days after his resurrection, and as the kingdom was not established until forty days after the resurrection of the Son of God, up to the time of his ascension to the Father, the theory that it was established during the personal ministry of the Saviour or in the days of John the Baptist, is a false theory, and opposed to the word of God. This being true with regard to the gentleman's church, it is wrong in its

commencement, and therefore can not be the church of Christ. But in connection with this passage we call your attention to a passage found in Luke xix., beginning with the 11th verse, where we have these words: "And as they heard these things he added and spake a parable because he was nigh to Jerusalem and because they thought that the KINGDOM OF GOD SHOULD IMMEDIATELY APPEAR." Now, here the disciples thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear. It had not yet appeared, or otherwise his disciples would not have thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear. Language can not be plainer than this, for these disciples, if the kingdom of God then existed, the disciples were in it, and if they were in it, they knew it. And if they were in it, and did not know it, there could be no advantage or enjoyment derived from being in it, for they knew it not. So then, if they were in it, they knew it, and from the very fact that they thought the kingdom of God would immediately appear, at this time it is clear that it did not exist, that it had not yet been established. But with the quotation further: they thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear, and he said, therefore, "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Well, the only answer that my friend has been able to give to the argument founded upon this parable is, that the coming of the nobleman is at the close of time, while he enters not into the argument at all. The nobleman here represents Jesus, the king and founder of this kingdom, presented as the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of which we speak, then we say that Jesus is represented by the nobleman as the king, and *he went to receive a kingdom.* The question is not in regard to coming, but in regard to his going to receive the kingdom. He was to receive a kingdom, that kingdom was not received before he did go, and if that kingdom was not received before he did go, it was

not established before he went away; and if not established before he went away, it was not established during the personal ministry of Jesus here in the world, or in the days of John the Baptist. Hence, we say, so far as my friend's argument is concerned in regard to the beginning of his church, it is not the one presented as the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ in the word of God. Secondly, we state that the name is wrong; they, the Baptists, have not the Scripture name, and this the gentleman admits so far as the name of his church is concerned. He says, God gave the name to John as the Harbinger of the church, but not to the church as a church name. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S SECOND ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN, MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED CONGREGATION: It seems to me my worthy friend is very unfortunate in entering this discussion, for he denies a proposition that he confesses he does not understand. He does not know, for the life of him, what church I belong to. Then, it may turn out that I belong to the very same church that he does! If he does not know, I am sorry for him. When I denied his proposition, I knew what I was doing. Neither did I try to get off on what I would denominate a quibble, because his brethren call themselves "Disciples" in Virginia, and "Christians" here. I might ask, "now which church do you belong to?" "Here you are called *Christians;* in some places *Reformers*, in others *Disciples.*" Now, here are three or four churches! "Some hold one view, and some another; which do you belong to?" But, I did not kick up so much dust out of a diversity of names. I did not attempt to quibble. I sought to meet the issue squarely. The gentleman knows there is a denomination calling themselves the "Christian Society," or *Christian Church;* others who claim to be the "church of God," but, are different denominations. This he ought to know. Did I affirm that he belonged to this society, or that society? Did I try to make the impression that I could not tell whether the Dr. belonged to this, that, or the other church? If the gentleman has not sufficient intelligence to enable him to understand what church I belong to, I frankly tell him I don't propose to give it to him. Understand me, however, upon this subject, I am ready to give him

all information, if he will receive it, and advance with the examination of the characteristics.

But, again, in regard to the denomination. I spoke simply of the *Baptists* of America. I have here the Year Book, containing the statistics for 1873. There we find that the Baptists—leaving out the little sects and a few Seventh Day Baptists and Dunkers, and these outside parties, that you call Free Will Baptists—that they number: churches, 19,720; ministers, 11,893; membership, 1,585,232. The Methodist denomination comes next in the list, as given in the statistical account. The number given here is 1,421,323, including 123,100 in full connection, and 190,315 on probation. Counting those in full membership, the Baptists amount almost to half a million more than even our Methodist friends. I do not base an argument on this, but only allude to it because the gentleman seems to be so badly confused as to who the Baptists are; I want to show him that there are in the Baptist Church, in America, about six times as many members as in his own church. And yet, he can not tell who they are! I said, in history, when we come to the books of denominations, we are simply put down as *Baptists*. I did not say that we were never called by anything else. Sometimes people call us Particular Baptists; sometimes *General Baptists*, because we believe, the most of us, in the general atonement. Sometimes we are called Regular Baptists; sometimes we are called Missionary Baptists, because we preach the gospel everywhere, and yet we are the same people, associated together in the Lord's work and called Baptists. With the exception of a few Antinomian brethren, who have gone out from us, the great mass of the Baptists of America stand associated together. If the gentleman does not know it, I will simply say he ought to have informed himself before he got himself into such a position as he is now in; or, at least, he ought to receive the information that we give him as we advance.

But the name "immerser church." According to his argument, if it is the immerser church it is not the right church, because it has not the right name! It is of no consequence to him that a half million of our brethren have been martyrs to the truth we advocate here to-night? We have never changed the name. When we go back to the first administrator of the sacred ordinance of baptism, he was called *the Baptist.* But, suppose we are called the *immerser church,* would that make it a different church? According to the gentleman's argument a different name makes it a different church! Will he please tell me what the name should be? First, where, in what chapter of the Bible, is a name given which is to be used to the exclusion of all others? I want him to tell me, because he can not find *Christian Church* named in the Bible to save his life, even if it was to keep him from purgatory. It is strange that he should make such a hurrah about a name, when he can not find the name of his own church in the Bible. But, he says, "therefore we are the true church, because we have the right name." Well, according to your own argument we are the true church, because we are called *Christians.* There never has been a time when we were not called *Christians,* since the days when the people first began to follow Christ. I do not claim it was by divine authority.

The gentleman seemed to be almost converted to the doctrine of church succession. He says he does not contend that the kingdom has an end. It does last all the time; but the kingdom—well, it died! certainly died!! but when a man dies, that is not the end of him, because his soul lives!!! Well, I wish the Doctor, as he is progressing on the succession matter, I want him to tell me when the church of the living God died? whether it was buried? did anybody preach its funeral sermon? Then I wish him to tell me who resurrected it from the dead? or whether it has had a resurrection. I wish to know the man that had power to breathe life into the

dead carcass of that church that was dead, buried, and rotten in the grave. But, the Dr. says, "it did not have an end." It only died; and for long and dreary centuries there was no church upon the earth. Well, where was it then? The gentleman's position contradicts, it seems to me, directly and palpably the eternal word of God, which declares He shall reign over the house of Jacob *forever.* That stone that was cut from the mountain without hands did not start upon the earth and then stop, but that stone that symbolized the kingdom rolled on and rolled on, until it became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. That prophecy of Micah and Isaiah has reference to the triumph of the kingdom, when it shall be exalted above the mountains. I want the gentlemen to tell me exactly about when the kingdom died, and when it was resurrected. Do not forget that. It is true, he did not say it was exactly dead, but, then, it was dead according to his illustration.

But, the Dr. says, the church, or kingdom, was prevailed against—the saints were *overcome.* Well, the Bible does not say that the kingdom was prevailed against. The little horn made war against the saints, and prevailed against them for a certain time. I suppose, according to the gentleman's argument, since that time there can not be any saints, as they are out of the kingdom of God.

In Dan. vii. 27, it is said that the time should come when the people of the saints should possess the kingdom of the most High, "whose kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom." Then it did not come to an end.

But in regard to the succession and the authorities the gentleman has read. These authorities do not testify in regard to the gentleman's position, for Benedict simply said that if *all the facts could be disclosed a very good succession could be made out.* He affirmed the existence of the facts. As an historian he said the facts did exist, and he had developed some of

them himself; but he was not proving succession. He did not think it necessary, nor do any of the Baptists think it necessary in order to establish their claim, to prove succession from an uninspired historic standpoint. But we do believe that the succession must exist. And when we find an organization set up by a man—an uninspired man—of recent date, we know that is not the original, or church of Christ. As I have remarked before, however, that succession must exist of necessity. And now in regard to his argument as to the Baptist commencement: Suppose that he is right—that the kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, and our theory, as he says, is wrong; the succession still exists, whether we trace it or not. Then, the fact that we were mistaken a year or two in regard to the precise time of the setting up of the kingdom, if it were granted, would not in the least militate against our church claims, to be the church of the living God. Suppose that I should say that Darwin was not a man, because he had introduced a wrong theory about the origin of man! That would be about as good an argument as the getleman's. Holding a theory that man has been developed and originated, perhaps, from the lowest order of animal life, and yet in time comes up to a man; therefore, Darwin is not a man! because he has a false theory of the origin of man. No, sir. His argument is out again, entirely. And then I wish him to notice the Scriptures, that say: "the law and the prophets were until John. Since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it." "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent taketh it by force." Then, again, "the Pharisees shut up the kingdom against men, and would not enter in themselves, nor suffer those who were entering to go in." But, as I have answered him, now I will proceed.

I read you now from Mr. Campbell, as a historian on succession, in his Purcell debate, p. 77: "Every sect and individ-

ual, as I said before, is passive in receiving a name. Sectarian names are generally given in the way of reproach; thus, the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, most probably in derision; yet it was a very proper name. Call us what you please, however, it does not change nature or race. The disciples of Christ are the same race, call them Christians, Nazarenes, Galileans, Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Protestants, or what you please. A variety of designations affects not the fact which we allege; we can find an unbroken series of Protestants—a regular succession of those who protested against the corruptions of the Roman Church, and endeavored to hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, from the first schism in the year 250 A. D. to the present day; and you may apply to them what description or designation you please." So Mr. Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, the founder of the gentleman's church, testifies that there is an unbroken succession extending down through the ancient Waldenses, designated by a variety of names and nicknames, until the Reformation of the sixteenth century. This shows that the gentleman is wrong in declaring that the church has come to an end.

But I want to give you another testimony on the subject, as we want to strengthen this line and show, by undisputed testimony, the truth of our position, so that it will be admitted by any one capable of investigating the historic points. Cardinal Hosius, one of the most learned and eminent Catholic writers in his day, president of the Council of Trent, says: (I read now from the "Baptist Martyrs," p. 19, there is a quotation made by Mr. Brown, the editor of the Religious Encyclopedia): "If you behold their cheerfulness in suffering persecution, the Anabaptists run *before all* the heretics. If you have regard to number, *it is likely that in multitude, they would swarm above all others, if they were not grievously plagued and cut off with the knife of persecution.* If you have an eye to

the outward appearance of godliness, both the Lutherans and Zwinglians must needs grant that they *far pass them.* If you will be moved by the boasting of the word of God, these be no less bold than Calvin to preach; and their doctrine must stand aloft—above all the glory of the world—*must stand invincible above all power,* because it is not their word, but the word of the living God." Then, Mr. Brown adds: "Those who think to do battle against the Baptists, as a modern, reactionary, ephemeral sect, will find themselves greatly mistaken." Those who thus suppose are mistaken. The Baptists are not a modern sect, but stand out as the church of the living God. Again, Mr. Brown has said—(the very same one that the gentleman referred to as admitting, as he supposed, his position, which is not correct)—p. 17 Baptist Martyrs: "The Baptists have no difficulty whatever in tracing up their principles and their churches to the apostolic age. It has been often said by our enemies, that we originated in the German city of Munster, in 1534. Lamentable must be the weakness or ignorance of such an assertion, come from whom it may. It were easy to cite eminent Pedobaptist historians to refute this calumny." This is the testimony of Mr. Brown, one of the ablest men that ever lived on this continent. Bear in mind, these facts I read are not Baptist testimony, but the testimony of learned Pedobaptists. I wish to call your attention to other authorities now, admitting the same thing in regard to the Baptist Church, by men who knew a little more about the Baptist history than my worthy friend. Mr. Campbell said in the Campbell and Maccalla debate, p. 378: "From the apostolic age to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists, and their practice of baptism, have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced." He did not come up and say "we could not tell anything about the Baptists; we don't know who they are, or what they are." In every century along

down the dreary pathway of time, the sentiments and practices of the Baptists have a continued chain, says Mr. Campbell—and I believe, while I am quoting the testimony of Mr. Campbell, I will give another. This was while he was associated with the Baptists he said this, but he said it as a historian. But, after he set up his church, operating for himself sometimes, the question came up, where was the church before your time? where was the kingdom? and he was pressed sorely as my friend has been pressed lately on this subject. That is the reason he would not answer these questions that stand against him unanswered, and will stand to the end of time, unless he gets up and answers them before this discussion closes. Mr. Campbell, writing to Dr. Thomas, when Dr. Thomas had commenced re-immersing some of his own Disciples that had come to them from the Baptists—Millennial Harbinger, vol. 7, p. 57, 58—says: "This [that there are some worthy Baptists] exactly accords with the views of some of our brethren long since expressed—that as it was with the Jews, in the times of the Messiah and his apostles, so it is now with the Baptists. The nation, as such, continued to be the kingdom of God, until they rejected the offered salvation; so the present kingdom of God was found amongst those who plead for faith, repentance, and baptism, as necessary to admission into the kingdom of grace, until the present call upon them to reformation. Since the rejection of that call by them, *as a people*, or so far as any of them have opposed this reformation, they are not of the kingdom of God; and especially such as have been immersed by them, having heard before their immersion the original gospel, are unworthy of the confidence in the brethren of the reformation." Mr. Campbell was a historian. He grappled with Mr. Purcell on history, and he debated with some of the most learned of the Pedobaptists; and he said that the kingdom of God (this is the substance of what he testified) *the kingdom of God was with the Baptists till*

He called them to reform; and then God took the kingdom away from the Baptists and gave it to the Disciples. But the prophecy of Daniel forbids the conclusion. He says, "it shall not be left to other people," and if God gave it to them, the Baptists were the depositories of that true church. The kingdom of God was with them along the path of 1800 years, and I will ask, when almost rivers of blood have flowed from the martyrs belonging to the true church—I will ask, is it reasonable to suppose that God has taken that kingdom away from them and given it to Mr. Campbell's Disciples. Believe it who can, I do not believe any such statement.

Here, again, is a statement I have from that learned man who prepared an analysis of the Bible, Mr. Hitchcock (page 1117, from the article "Baptists"): "BAPTISTS—Who hold that a personal profession of faith, and an immersion in water, are essential to baptism. They claim that they have existed as Christian communities from the days of the apostles, and have held pure the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel through all ages." And here I wish to make this statement: Of all the authors of these books, such as Buck's Theological Dictionary, Burder's History of Religion, Milner, in regard to the religious denominations of the world, and others, while they fail not to tell who was the father and founder of the various denominations, when they come to the Baptists, whether friend or foe, no man ever dares put his finger upon the man, whether near or far back in history, and say, Here is the founder and head of the Baptist Church! We will see, by and by, in tracing the history of the Baptists, that hated sect of olden time, that in the language of one of the historians their origin lay in the remote depths of antiquity. I have the testimony here of many church historians, all to the same effect, and you have heard the testimony of Benedict, that the succession exists. I read now from the Baptist Manual, p. 82: "Our principles are as old as Christianity.

We acknowledge no founder but Christ. With enthusiasts in Germany, or in any age or country, we have no connection, and our forefathers never had. Enthusiasts may be designated by the same name, but that proves nothing. Persons holding our distinctive principles—*i. e.*, the baptism of believers only—have appeared in all ages of the Christian era. From Christ to the end of the second century there were NO OTHERS; at least, if there were any, their history is a blank." I might quote passage after passage from the historians, of like effect; but the gentleman has not met, as yet, the testimony of Christ and the prophets, that the kingdom was to have no end. His poor apology about the kingdom dying and being revived again is certainly very strange for one that believes in God's word. He ought certainly to *reform* from such a position, and not take it any more. I want him to consider these passages again. You better, if possible, tell this people where that kingdom has been all the time. Where is the church of the living God? Again I affirm, as certain as God's word is true, there is a succession of the true kingdom of Christ, a perpetuity of his church. Why? Because God's word is pledged to it. And I have introduced the testimony of two of the most eminent and learned historians that ever lived on the continent of Europe, both Pedobaptists, in support of my position. I have introduced the testimony of Cardinal Hosius, who testifies to the remote origin of the Anabaptists, as he calls them, that suffered for the cause of Christ; and in another place he says 1200 years before his time they had suffered the most cruel sorts of punishment.

MR. LUCAS—Where does he say that, that they suffered 1200 years?

MR. RAY—I will read it in my proofs, as I advance.

MR. LUCAS—I would like to have your authority.

MR. RAY—I expect to give the authority.

MR. LUCAS—That's right: we want it.

MR. RAY—I say, this is the testimony of Cardinal Hosius, that eminent and learned Catholic. And I wish to state another argument here, that the Baptists claim no leader, no founder, no head, but the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' SECOND REPLY.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In regard to the authority which the gentleman has quoted concerning the sufferings of the ancient Baptists, I do not think the gentleman will find it just exactly as he stated it, and that is the reason I asked him for it. I have read a little on that subject myself.

He refers to Benedict again, and has quoted Orchard. I know just what Orchard says. I have him here, and Duncan, and Jones, and all these authorities of the Baptist Church. I know just what they say. The gentleman, it would seem, would prove all his propositions by his Baptist authorities, occasionally introducing Mr. Campbell. Mr. Campbell was a Baptist when he made the statement which has been quoted, the first one he quoted from Campbell. The gentleman seems to hold on to this question of succession, and he seems to think it necessary, though he says it is not necessary, to establish succession, in order to make out his church as the visible church. Then, why does he not advance? Why does he take an hour and a half to establish a thing that is not necessary to identify his church?

Then, suppose that we were to admit, for the sake of argument, his doctrine of succession. He says it is not necessary to establish his church, to identify his church. Now, suppose we admit it all. Then what has he gained? Just for the sake of the argument we admit his question of succession. But he has not gained a single point; for he says it is not necessary to establish the identity of his church. We do not

believe a word of it, but for the sake of the argument we will admit it, just to get him to advance in his argument, for he says it does not prove the identity of his church, even if it be true.

But, then, we call your attention to the character of his authority, while the subject is up. What does Robinson say, and Benedict indorse? Says he: "The doctrine of uninterrupted succession is necessary only to such churches as regulate their faith and practices by tradition, and for their use it was invented."

Now, this is what Robinson says, and what Benedict indorses. He says here that the succession is not necessary, and my friend says he indorses Benedict, when he states what might be done if the facts were disclosed. Now, I wish to know if a man can know the facts, know whether they exist or not, if they have not been disclosed. Can a man know a thing as a fact, unless it has been disclosed? Well, everybody says, no! Well, then, Benedict does not know that the facts exist. It was simply an opinion that there were facts; yet he does not know anything of them, because they have not been disclosed. It was his opinion, if they were disclosed, that there were facts, and then a very good succession could be made out; yet, if it were made out, it is not necessary to the identification of this church, not necessary at all. But that little "if" is in the way, and there is the great trouble; and his Baptist Encyclopedia says, "For several hundred years"—as we have read time and again in your hearing upon this subject—"we have not a history of the church; yet we have a full history of the Anti-christ;" yet, on the other hand, we have not a history of the church for several hundred years. He attempts to prove by Campbell that the kingdom was once given to the Baptists. "Now, then, I would like to have a little Bible upon this question. These are questions that are to be determined by the Bible." I deny this state-

ment, and I deny Mr. Campbell's statement, if Mr. Campbell says what he reports him to say. I deny both of them; for I deny that God ever did give to the Baptists the kingdom of His Son. That is the proposition I deny, and I ask authority from the word of God upon the question. Where is the authority? We must go to the word of God. He must show from that book that the Baptist Church is the church of Jesus Christ, or he fails. But he seems to be very slow to go to the word of God to identify his church. He would rather quote from Campbell, and from this one and that one, outside of the word of God. He can do a great deal better there than in the Scriptures, for the word of God says but very little about his church.

But he says I am pretty nearly converted to Baptist succession. A person would suppose that I have very strong faith in the Baptist succession, from the way I talk about it, would he not? When I told you I did not believe a word of it, that there is no authority for it at all, but that the succession is built upon *tradition*, and not upon the WORD OF GOD as we have affirmed time and again, and yet he says I talk as though I was pretty nearly converted to succession—to Baptist succession. Well, if that is the idea I have impressed upon your minds, I will just let it remain.

In regard to the name again. I said in English that his church would be the Immerser Church, in Greek that it would be the Baptist church, for Baptist was the Greek simply anglicised. He said that Christ meant anointed, and, says he, it is a different name in English. I say it is simply the same name expressed in a different language, that is all, and I stated in English the name of his church would be the Immerser Church; in the Greek it would be the Baptist, that is all; but I say that his name, either in Greek or in English, is not found in the word of God—the name of his people. The name of one man, John the Baptist, or John the Immerser, is found

in the Bible—the name of but one man, John, the harbinger of Jesus, that was to prepare a people for the Lord. Then he says in regard to the church: "Well, the Doctor, if he don't know what church I belong to, I won't tell him." Well, I guess not, I guess he will not, for I am beginning to think that the gentleman hardly knows himself which church he belongs to. I think it a difficult matter for him to determine this question himself. Now, suppose the gentleman knows, and that I know what church he belongs to? He is not discussing this question for my benefit only, he is discussing this question for your benefit, and for all that shall read this discussion, and it is hardly presumable that all will know when they read this book, unless he tells them, which Baptist Church he belongs to; because they are just as certain to read that he belongs to the Baptist Church without the qualifying phrase, they are just as certain to read that, as they read this debate, that his Baptist Church has no qualifying phrase; and they are just as certain to read of the ten Baptist churches that have a qualifying phrase that we have quoted from his own Baptist authority giving the different Baptist churches, and as he belongs to the Baptist Church that has no qualifying phrase, and according to his own statement he does not belong to any one of these ten, I should like to know to what church he belongs. I say this question is legitimate, and he ought to answer it, if he can; but probably he does not know himself. He said there was no trouble about the church he belonged to, because he at the commencement, in defining the proposition, said: "I will tell you to what church I belong to, I will tell you just precisely where I stand;" but then he has not done it, and one of three things must be true, either that he does not know, or, secondly, that he is ashamed to tell; or, thirdly, he is a very unaccommodating gentleman. One of these three things must be true; I leave you to determine which one is true. Until the gentleman settles this question, one of these must be true.

But he comes to these prophecies, the prophecy of Daniel and the declaration found in Revelations, again. Now, I read from Daniel (vii. 21, 22), where it is positively asserted that the little horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them, and said there was a time when it prevailed, and there will be a time when it will not prevail. "Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." But there was a time when they were prevailed against, and when they did not possess the kingdom, the visible kingdom of God. We are talking about the visible kingdom, as expressed in the proposition under discussion, and I state that the gentleman can not show an unbroken chain in the existence of the visible church or kingdom of God. There were people in Babylon that God recognized as his people, but in Babylon they did not constitute the visible church or kingdom of Jesus Christ, and I do not presume that the gentleman will affirm this to the audience that in Babylon they constituted the visible church and kingdom of Jesus Christ. I don't presume he will affirm this, I feel very certain he will not. Then there was a time we show when they were prevailed against, when for hundreds of years the visible church or kingdom of Jesus Christ could not be made out. We have no history of it for that length of time, according to his own Baptist authorities that we have read to you, and this is in strict accordance with the Scriptures read. We call your attention to the statements made in the 13th chapter of Revelations, made by John while upon the Isle of Patmos: "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." Now, then, they are said to be overcome, to be prevailed against, and consequently we said the argument founded by the gentleman on the 18th verse and 16th chapter of Matthew was valueless, as it

could not be the church, as the saints were prevailed against and overcome. You could not have a visible church without the saints; it must, therefore, refer to the rock. Now, he took care not to notice the parable of the nobleman going away to receive his kingdom. He took particular care not to notice this passage which we introduced upon the subject. And now he calls our attention again to a few authorities in order to show, I suppose, that these passages quoted by me are not true. I shall say that this must be the result of his effort until he shows that these passages are perfectly consistent, and are not at all opposed to each other, or his interpretations of them. We have shown that the kingdom had not appeared, that Jesus went away to receive the kingdom, showing that he had not yet received it. We notice again, Matthew xi. 11, 12, one of the passages quoted by the gentleman, which has been up several times, but the gentleman has again noticed it and called your minds to it: "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of woman there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Now, then, I submit this point upon this passage, that if the kingdom of heaven existed in the days of John, John was in it, and yet it is affirmed that there was not a greater born of woman—a greater than John the Baptist—and yet the least in the kingdom is greater than John, that is, the least in the kingdom is greater than the greatest in the kingdom. Now, these are the difficulties that come up before the gentleman in this portion of the word of God. And "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force;" and the parallel passage reads: "that the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached." Well, the gentleman has admitted that the apostles were never called until after John was in prison, and the Saviour never gave to

the disciples the kingdom until he went away. That was forty days after the resurrection of Christ; and yet with all these statements, he would now labor to make the impression upon your minds that the kingdom, since John, or from the very time that John appears, that from that very period the kingdom of God has been preached, has actually existed. And this is the point that we deny. We say it was preached at hand, as drawing near, but not preached as actually existing; and the gentleman has failed to show that it did actually exist. We say, therefore, his church is wrong, because it has a wrong beginning; and having a wrong beginning, a different beginning from that of the church of Jesus Christ, it can not be the visible church, or kingdom of the Son of God.

We call your attention to the second argument against the gentleman's church, that is, that their name is wrong; they have the wrong name. There is but one person in the universe of God referred to in the Scripture as Baptist at all, and that is John the Baptist, the harbinger of Jesus Christ, the only one; and, therefore, we say his name is not the name.

But we call your attention to a third fact—the third argument against the gentleman's church. Now, then, I know that he will tell you when he gets a little further along—he has been more economizing of his material to-night than he was at Canton, for he is beginning at the other end, as he can talk longer upon succession, probably, than anything else—he will tell you that he has the right foundation; that his church has the Scriptural foundation, and yet the Mennonites are one of the links of his church. I say he is wrong, because he has not the true foundation. I will quote from Orchard to show the true foundation of his church, the Mennonites being identical, according to his own admission, with the Baptist Church. Orchard (p. 367) says: "Other churches are *founded* on this principle, that *practical piety is the essence of religion.*" Here,

then, according to the statement made by Orchard himself, that is the foundation. Well, I want to call your attention to the principles and practices of the Baptists by Wayland, and with this statement that that church is founded upon this principle, we are enabled to understand something of what Wayland here says, a Baptist authority, on p. 147: "From several of the previous numbers, it will be perceived that we believe the Baptists to hold a distinct position among the Protestant *sects.*"

We call your attention to this fact, that he records the Baptist Church as a *sect;* that that is the light in which Dr. Wayland, a Baptist, and the author of this book, regards the Baptist Church. He regards it as a sect among other sects; "that they entertain sentiments," he says, "which, if carried into practice, must render them somewhat peculiar, and that they are perfectly capable of establishing their own usages"—they are capable of this as a matter of course—"and appealing to no other source than that of themselves, they are capable of establishing their own usages, and of adopting their modes of worship and rules of discipline." They are capable within themselves of doing all this, of adapting their modes of worship and rules of discipline to the principles which they believe, as embodied, according to Orchard, in the foundation, the foundation upon which their church rests, of adapting their principles to that foundation, and thus regulating their modes of worship and their discipline. Here, then, we say is the positive statement and testimony of Wayland, of the principles and practices of the Baptists; he calls it, as before stated, a sect among other sects. I want to call your attention to the fact, that he has not simply made this statement once, but he has made it on different occasions. Page 121: "I have, on several occasions, alluded to the fact that we have suffered losses as Baptists, by following the customs of other denominations, which would almost seem, to an observer, that

we were ashamed of our denominational sentiments, and took pleasure in testifying that between us and other sects there were no real points of difference. I think the points of difference are important, and that our whole history is, in the highest degree, honorable to us as a Christian sect." Dr. Wayland says the Baptist Church is a sect, but my friend says it is the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. Dr. Wayland says it is a sect among other sects, and that they are capable of arranging, as I read to you, and of adapting their own modes of worship and rules of discipline, and this is Baptist authority on this question. We quote, not what anybody outside of the Baptist Church says about his organization or institution, but we quote such as he admits to be authoritative. He admits these as of authority and position in his church, and, therefore, we quote from them.

His church is wrong, because it has the wrong foundation; being founded, according to his own theory, at the time that he says it was, it can not rest upon the true foundation, because Jesus is presented as that foundation, and he was not the foundation until he was tried, tried by Satan's temptations in the garden, and in his sufferings and in his poverty, and tried upon the cross at Calvary, when he suffered and died. "And being made perfect," according to Paul, "he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." He became the tried stone, and when tried the stone which the builders rejected has since that trial become the head corner; upon this tried stone the church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ is established. But his church, he says, was established before this time, and consequently it was not built upon this tried stone; and hence it is not the true church of Christ, because it is not founded upon the foundation that Christ presents to our view. But, then, it is not upon the true foundation, from this fact: Paul affirms in the second chapter of Ephesians and the closing part of the chapter, that

the middle wall of partition was taken away when he was nailed to the cross—the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile was taken away; and when this was done, the new man, the one new church was founded upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. That one new man, one new church was not founded, was not constituted, was not placed upon the foundation until after the middle wall of partition was taken away by the death of Jesus Christ. He says, his church was established before that time. Jesus says, his church was established, and so does Paul, after that time. They can not be mistaken. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Sixth Evening.

ELDER RAY'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Brethren, Moderators, and Respected Audience: I feel happy this evening—this precious Sabbath evening—that I can have the privilege of standing up in support of the proposition read again in your hearing. Before I proceed in my line of argument, I wish briefly to call your attention to some of the points in the last speech of my friend. And, first, in regard to his remark that the Greek Catholics claim succession. I understand that the Roman Catholics and Greek Catholics to be but the two great branches of Catholicism. His trouble seems to remain in regard to the Baptist church, and what church I stand identified with. It seems, notwithstanding his great ability and learning, blindness has happened unto him in regard to the Baptists. For the life of him he can not imagine what church I belong to; and yet I read from authorities setting forth our principles; and the very fact that he accepted the position denying the proposition, is admitting that he understood what he was denying. But, if he does not understand the proposition, I will try and continue to try to give him light upon it. I imagine that any person, who has ever been able to know anything in regard to church matters, would not have the slightest difficulty in knowing my denominational whereabouts. But

the gentleman wants to know about the various denominational names, and he mentions several names that have been by some applied to us; and he imagines that they are different parts of the denomination. I still remark that we are known in history simply as *Baptists*—neither more, nor less; and further information is given about our characteristics, faith, and practices, etc. But, if the Dr. wants me to say more upon my own responsibility, I will say that we are *missionary* Baptists, for our mission is to evangelize the world. I will say, again, that we are *regular* Baptists, for we observe the ordinances of the Lord's house in regular order. Third, I will say that we are *separate* Baptists, as we are distinguished from the world and other denominations by our peculiarities. Again, I will say we are *united* Baptists, because we are united in regard to the great principles of church organization; and, upon this point, I express the opinion that we stand more united in faith and practice than any other denomination that exists upon the face of the earth. Again, I will say that we are *general* Baptists, for we hold that Christ died for every man; again, I will say that we are *particular* Baptists, for we exclude from our fellowship such as are given over absolutely to heresy, or immorality. And, that the gentleman may have full information upon the subject, I will say to him that I am identified with that great body of Baptists that declared "non-fellowship" with Mr. Campbell and his Disciples, and excluded them from their fellowship; and if he does not know who they were, he must search and find out. Dr. Jeter is identified with the same denomination; and I might speak of Richard Fuller, of Baltimore; I might speak of the Broadduses; I might speak of the works of Carson, of Ireland, of the Holmses, of the Clark's, and those mighty men of past years. I might speak of Dr. Williams, of Missouri, one of the giants of your own beloved State, all of these have been identified with the same church, but, still the Dr.

can not tell to what denomination I belong! He is very well informed on every other subject, but blindness is upon him in regard to the Baptists, and I am sorry for it.

But, he tells us the kingdom has been prevailed against and overcome; and yet, God has had a people all the time. He contends, also, that there can be no people of God out of the kingdom, therefore, his admission that there have been people of God all the time, is an admission that the kingdom of God has stood all the time. There is no escape from that conclusion. But, he says, that it died, and he gives an illustration. He says he has read history. Perhaps I have been entirely mistaken in regard to his historical research, or his ability, as a thorough historian, but I want him to tell this people precisely when that kingdom died, how it died, and what was the disease of which it died, or who killed it; and I wish him to tell in what year it was buried. I ask him to tell me, also, who resurrected it from the dead, if it has ever had a resurrection; or, whether it still sleeps in the silent grave of death. It is hardly worth while to notice what he says in regard to the kingdom, when he makes the same speeches over again. Dear friends, every point that he has sprung, I believe has been up before us in the former proposition, and fully discussed; and in the written report of the discussion I do not wish all my speeches simply to be a repetition of the same thing. I shall let him go on in this line, however, for the present—until he gets tired of talking about matters that have already been thoroughly discussed and disposed of; and when he has gathered sufficient material together to justify a reply, I shall make it. But it is evident, he will have to make the same speeches half a dozen times yet. When he gets done, I will reply to them in a few moments.

So then I must advance in the line. Concerning his criticism about the "gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" "it" he says, must evidently refer to "rock." I find that Wil-

son's Emphatic Dioglott renders the Greek pronoun *autes* by "*her;*" "the gates of hades shall not prevail against her." The Dr. stands out against nearly the entire world of critics in regard to his interpretation of the passage. But his skill in Greek criticism was exhibited the other night, when he undertook to find a parallel to the command "repent, and be baptized," in the second of Acts; but he did not find even a parallel word in the examples that he produced. And, then, he got to talking Greek; and I want him to pronounce Greek to the students here that are learning that language. They are learning to pronounce Greek, and I would like to have the gentleman give them a few lessons in the pronunciation of that language, inasmuch as he seems to be teacher and translator on this occasion. I ask him to come up to this work at once.

But he says: "We admit the Baptist succession, for the sake of getting on." I do not want him to admit and deny, blow hot and cold with the same breath. If he intends to say that the Baptists have the succession, I wish him to admit it squarely, and say boldly that the Baptists have stood from the time that Jesus was on earth until now. If he denies it, I want him to put his hand upon the man that set the Baptists up; I wish no dodging the question. He professes to be a historian, and this is one reason why I am willing to shoulder the expense of publishing this work to the world for future generations. I desire a representative man before me, so that when I quote historical facts, if they were wrong, he might be able to show their fallacy. I am glad therefore that I have such an opportunity. If he will admit that we have the succession from the time of Christ until now, I will go on from this time forth to develop other points of the line. If not, he must come directly to the point, and show where our succession fails.

But, he says, "I deny what Mr. Campbell has said in re-

gard to the kingdom being with the Baptists." Here, then, is a Disciple—a, son ecclesiastically, of that venerable man, who has passed away—who, when looking over the field of history, after years and years of investigation, deliberately said that the kingdom of God was with the Baptists, until his reformation (that is the substance of his statement) ; here, I say, is a Disciple who stands up and says that Mr. Campbell made an erroneous statement. "I deny it." How strange that he will array himself thus against the ablest minds of his own church.

But, the wrong name. He has gone back on the name *Christos* again. Well, dear friends, if we are to have the name of the Redeemer, it can not be Christ, because that is *Christos* in the Greek language. It is not a proper name. That is the name of his office. The name is JESUS, called *Joshua* sometimes. That is the name of the Son of God. If we must adopt literally the name of the Redeemer, it must be *Jesus.* The gentleman knows this, as he is so learned in the Greek language.

But, he says the Baptists have not the right foundation, and refers to Orchard upon this subject. Let us see what Orchard testifies, p. 367: "Menno drew up his plan of doctrine and practice entirely from the Scriptures, and threw it into the form of catechisms. His system was of a milder nature than had been adopted by the perfect class of ancient Baptists. He retained, indeed, all those doctrines commonly received among them, in relation to the baptism of infants, the millennium, the exclusion of the magistrates from the Christian assemblies, the abolition of war, the prohibition of oaths, and the vanity as well as the pernicious effects of human science. Their churches are founded on this principle, that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest and most infallible mark of a true church, is the sanctity of its members." And now, the gentleman undertook from that to make an impression that these Mennonite

Baptists do not claim Jesus as the foundation—that piety and spirituality is the fundamental principle with them. I will ask him what is the foundation of piety? Is it not Christ? Such a sophism, it seems to me, is unworthy of this grave occasion. The fundamental principle with them is the piety of membership. Does he object to this? It is not that they are founded upon an abstract principle, but that piety must grow out of their union with Christ as their foundation—which is acknowledged by all the denomination.

But, then, he referred to Mr. Wayland, in regard to the Baptists (p. 147), where Mr. Wayland speaks of the Baptists among the *Protestant sects*, and says that they are pefectly capable of establishing their own usages, and of adopting their modes of worship and rules of discipline, and the Dr. aimed, it seemed to me, to make the impression that the Baptists claimed principles of their own authorship. If he had read Wayland through, he would have found what principles Mr. Wayland called Baptist principles, p. 149, he says: "One of our essential beliefs is that of the spirituality of the church, that is, that the church of Christ is composed exclusively of spiritual or regenerated persons." But then, again, on p. 13: "The question is frequently asked, what is the creed, and what are the acknowledged standards of the Baptist churches in this country? To this, the general answer has ever been, 'Our rule of faith and practice is the New Testament.' We have no other authority to which we all profess submission." This is what he calls *our* rules and our usages. It is the *New Testament*, not dependent upon ecclesiastical councils and synods and courts, but the *New Testament*, and he emphasizes this stronger in another passage, p. 85: "The fundamental principle on which our difference from other evangelical denominations depends, is this: We profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, the *New Testament*, the whole New Testament, and *nothing but* the New

Testament. What is not there commanded is not binding. No matter by what reverence for antiquity, by what tradition, by what councils, by what consent of any branches of the church, or the whole church, at any particular period, an opinion or practice may be sustained, if it be not sustained by the command or the example of Christ, or of his apostles, we value it only as a precept of man, and we treat it accordingly. We disavow the authority of man to add to or take from the teachings of inspiration, as they are found in the New Testament. Hence, to a Baptist, all appeals to the fathers, or to antiquity, or general practice in early centuries, or in later times, are irrelevant and frivolous. He asks for *divine* authority as his guide in matters of religion, and if this be not produced, his answer is, 'in vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'" I have read this long extract to show that Wayland stands out and contends firmly and faithfully for the *New Testament—the Bible*, and that alone—as containing our rules and usages that we are governed by.

But, then, again, in regard to that authority mentioned from Cardinal Hosius. I want your attention to that a moment (p. 364 of Orchard's History of the Baptists): "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of every sect shows in suffering, then the opinions and persuasions of *no sect can be truer or surer* than those of the *Anabaptists;* since there have been none for *these twelve hundred years past* that have been more grievously punished." Showing that for 1200 years past those that he denominates Anabaptists have been grievously punished for their principles, 1200 years before the reformation of the sixteenth century. Thus this man, a Catholic cardinal, testifies to the sufferings of the Baptists.

Now, I want your attention, again, while I condense in as short space as possible the testimony of the gentleman's own

brethren for the succession of the church. Mr. Campbell has testified to the succession, as already read, and I wish to read from him again upon the subject (p. 65 of the Debate with Purcell): "We can, however, show that from the earliest times there has existed a people whom no man can remember, that have earnestly and consistently contended for the true faith *once* delivered to the saints." Showing that Mr. Campbell emphatically, repeatedly, and deliberately contended for the succession of the church. As shown already, he contended that that succession was with the Baptists until the Reformation.

But, I will call your attention to Moses Lard's Quarterly, for 1866, p. 309: "The 'rock' is not that against which the unseen is not to prevail; neither has the church ever become extinct. These we deem gross errors." Again: Mr. Fanning says (Living Pulpit, p. 520): "The church was built upon the rock laid in Zion; that she has withstood the rough waves of eighteen centuries; and that she will finally triumph gloriously over all the principalities and powers of earth." Mr. Benjamin Franklin (Living Pulpit, p. 348) says: "A community not founded at the right time is not the kingdom of Christ." Page 350: "If Popery was born *too late*, or is *too young* to be the true church, what shall be said of those communities born in the past three centuries? They are all too young by largely more than a thousand years. No church that came into existence since the death of the apostles can be the church of the living God." David Lipscomb (Gospel Advocate, for 1867, p. 770) says: "God founded a church that 'will stand' forever; that the gates of hell shall not prevail against." Isaac Errett, another prominent Disciple, in his Elements of the Gospel, p. 40, says: "Here is the setting up of the kingdom. Here is seen 'the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands,' which Nebuchadnezzar

saw, and which is yet to become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth."

I mention these to show that the entire weight of learning and criticism, from the great Mr. Campbell down, in the gentleman's church, contend for the perpetuity of the church, that it has stood from the time of Christ until the present time; and testimony upon testimony may be heaped together. Mr. Scott, the commentator, says, in speaking of Mat. xvi. 18: "Yet the church, established on the person of Christ, as Emanuel, the prophet, priest, and king of his redeemed people, still subsists; and it will assuredly ere long gain a decided victory over all its adversaries, of every name, on earth or in hell." This learned commentator contends for the perpetuity of the church, and so does nearly every commentator that can be found. I will state, that Benedict does not deny the perpetuity of the church, and I will venture to say he can not prove that Robinson denies it. I ask him to read Robinson here, to-night, and see if he denies the succession. I deny that Robinson testifies against the succession of the church, and call upon him for the proof. He talks as if he thought that Robinson is against me. I deny it. Benedict is not against me. And I have the talent of his church in favor of my proposition that I am advocating now—I mean, the perpetuity of the church. I might continue to read the authorities upon this subject until my friend is completely buried and overwhelmed with authorities.

But there are some that have attempted to show (not so well informed as my worthy friend, however) that the Antinomian brethren, because they call themselves the "Old Baptists," are the original church. I have collected the testimony from the ablest "old school" writers, admitting that they seceded from the denomination to which I belong. If the gentleman denies it, I have the testimony with me. I have the

testimony in regard to Roger Williams. There are some people who speak of Roger Williams as the progenitor of the Baptists of America. That is not the fact. While he embraced, to a large extent, Baptist principles, and took a leading part in planting Rhode Island colony, John Clark took the most prominent part in the planting of that colony, and in establishing Baptist principles in this country. I say, that *John Clark*, one of the brightest names in the history of the past, planted a church at Newport, Rhode Island, one year before the Providence society was organized. That church stands now with its original principles, and has stood through the storms of ages, from 1638 to the present time. Roger Williams, as I have the facts to show, only remained four months with that little society that he and Holliman set up. While he lived he never was connected with any other church organization. This society went down.

I have here the testimony where at least *twenty* Regular Baptist ministers, baptized in Europe, and all except two ordained there, who came across the briny deep and planted the Baptist principles here in the forests of America—I mean, they aided in the planting of churches.

Thomas Griffiths, one of those noble Welsh Baptists, with the church of which he was pastor, emigrated to America, and settled in Pennsylvania, where the church was called the Welsh Tract church. They kept up their church meetings while crossing the rolling billows of the Atlantic Ocean; and while surrounded by savages and wild beasts in the wilds of America they never ceased to worship the God of our fathers in a church capacity. They sent out colonies from that church, and there is one called the Welsh Neck church on the Pedee River, in South Carolina. That old *Welsh Tract* church was a hive which swarmed, or sent out colonies to form other churches. When I think of that dangerous time, and of those noble men that suffered in old continental

Europe, and who had been oppressed and persecuted, and who fled to our country and planted the very principles that were finally incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, those principles of liberty which Thomas Jefferson learned from a little Baptist church, the true principles of free government, I thank God that we have such a history, and I thank God that He has preserved His church. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My friend is now on his second night, and if you can find out where the argument is that he has offered, to show that his church possesses the characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ, then I will simply say that you are more fortunate than myself, for I have yet to see the argument. He has spent the former and his present speech almost entirely upon the doctrine of succession, and yet he says that it is not necessary to establish succession in order to show the identity of his church. He has spent all the time thus far in laboring to prove something that he says is not necessary to establish the truth of his proposition. If we were to admit succession, then he has gained nothing. But I call your attention to Orchard. He has labored to make the impression that the Anabaptists, as I understand him, have suffered or had suffered for twelve hundred years. I say this passage does not prove it. It does not say so, but it says this: "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists, since there have been none for these twelve hundred years past suffered more than they." Not that they have existed for the last twelve hundred years, but that a great many persons have suffered during that period, but "there have been none in that period of time that have suffered more than the Anabaptists." But my friend would make the impression that

the Anabaptists have been suffering all those twelve hundred years. That is the reason why I called for the authority last night.

My friend says that the Greek church and the Catholic church, as I understand him, are the same—they constitute one Catholic church. I will simply state that I suppose there is no one else here that understands the Greek church and the Catholic church to be one and the same. They are as distinct as any other two organizations upon the footstool of God. Both of them claim that they can trace a succession to the apostles, and I claim that is just about as good as my worthy friend's and the Baptist church to which he belongs can do. He sympathizes with me very much, because I lack the necessary perception to see the point. I am under very great obligations to my friend for his sympathy—under great obligations to him. But things are as they are, and I will have to let them stand so. With all his greatness, with all his powers, and his clear perception of the fact himself, and with his great command of language, I will simply say I do not see it yet. He has even made the thing a little darker in his last speech than it was before. I think I understand pretty well where he is, but then I want him to tell us, that the audience may know, and that all who read this debate may know where he is. He is not talking merely for me, but he is talking for all and to all that hear this discussion, and who may read it. And it comes out that while we have some ten different Baptist churches the gentleman belongs to all of them. That is the impression made by his last speech. He is a General Baptist, and he is a Missionary Baptist, he is a Particular Baptist, and he is a United Baptist—he belongs to nearly all of them. This may be true, but I will say I can not very readily see how a man can belong to so many distinct churches at the same time. We undertake to say that these churches are distinct organizations, that they are distinct churches, every

one independent of the other—not only in a congregational sense, but they have their independent associations, and in the very history from which we gathered the names of these different Baptist churches we find that it is stated that they hold but very little in common. They agree on the independency of their congregations, and their views with regard to the subject and action of baptism, so their histories state. But I would like for my friend to tell us whether he understands in his history, giving the history of the Baptists, that the Particular Baptists, the General Baptists, the Old Connection, the New Connection, the Scotch Baptists, the Regular Baptists, the Seventh Day Baptists, the Free-Will Baptists, and the Missionary Baptists, are all the same church. I would like that he would settle this question at once. He would seem to make the impression that he belongs to all of them. But he started out, I believe, with the Baptists without the qualifying phrase, and all those who have the qualifying phrase, such as "General" or "Particular," or "Seventh-Day," that they are sects that have gone off from the Baptist church. This was his statement in the beginning, and now it turns out that the descriptive phrase is not so objectionable after all, and that he not only belongs to one church that has the descriptive phrase, but that he belongs to pretty near all of them. This is clearing up matters with a vengeance.

But, again, the church "prevailed against," and yet God has always had a people. We have quoted the language of the word of God upon this subject, where the saints have been prevailed against and overcome, and yet we state that God has always had a people in Babylon, even at the time that the church was prevailed against, and the saints of God were overcome. But the gentleman has failed to tell us whether this people, in Babylon, constituted the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ, while they were in Babylon; and whether they constitute what he calls the Baptist

Church, with their unbroken chain of succession. He has failed to tell us this; and he wants to know what we have to say about the church when it went into the wilderness, and there is a question raised in regard to its death. We have simply denied the gentleman's proposition, and we want him to prove it. The gentleman is on the proving side now. We have denied his statement in regard to his succession, and we want him to prove it; then it will be time enough for us to attend to these other points. It will be time enough after he has proved, at least to his own brethren, to those that may hear him, that his position is correct.

He calls our attention again to Mat. xvi. 18. I will simply say that, so far as that passage is concerned, that Dr. Clarke, one of the ripest scholars that has ever lived, takes precisely the same position upon this subject that we have taken. But, as before stated, so far as this argument is concerned, it makes but little difference whether I admit that the pronoun "it" stands for church or not, for he has admitted that the succession—to prove a succession—is not necessary in order to identify his church. Then, suppose I were to admit, for the sake of argument, that the antecedent of the pronoun there is "church." Suppose I were to admit that the succession of the church is a fact—that there is an unbroken chain from the apostles to the present time—according to his own showing, this is not necessary in order to prove the identity of the church. I ask him, then, what he has gained? I told the gentleman last evening, that I would admit that "it" stands for church for the sake of the argument, that he might be induced to advance, though, personally, I do not believe a word of it. I do not believe any man on the face of the earth can prove an unbroken line of succession; but as it affects not the question one way or the other, according to his own admission, I admit it that he may advance. My position upon this subject, however, is perfectly definite. I state again, I do

not believe a word in regard to this unbroken chain of succession.

But, "Greek criticism:" The gentleman says I claim to be a scholar. I have not made any claim in that direction; but I will now say that I do claim to know when a man does not know. My friend is the individual that puts up the claim; for when he started upon this great effort of his to exterminate what he calls Campbellism, over in Illinois, at Blandinville, where he wanted all the strength of the Campbellite church, as he called it, in one man (so I was informed), that he could demolish it at one mighty stroke, and put it out of existence forever. Well, this is the man; this is the *great man.* Then he wanted to go to the Campbellite Jerusalem, at Canton, as he called it. He was ready to debate at Canton, LaGrange, Monticello, and then in all the region round about. He is the great man, *a great man, truly.* We will concede to him a great amount of greatness, and his failure appears with the greater force.

Dr. Ray, from Kentucky, is a great man, a Campbellite exterminator. But now, with regard to criticism, I call your attention to the statement in the first passage mentioned by me last night. My friend stated, either upon his own authority or upon the authority of his counsellor here, that there is but one verb imperative in that passage, and that is of the second person plural; and in the other, that all the verbs in the passage are of the same person and number. Now, we refer again to those passages. We will state his proposition, the argument, as we understand him, on the 2d of Acts was, that, as the word rendered "repent" was plural, and of the second person imperative, and "be baptized," in the passage, was of the third person singular, that those verbs could not have the same subject; and, therefore, the argument founded upon the passage by the connection of repentance and baptism by the conjunction, and the design there expressed by the

word "for," could not relate to repentance as it did to baptism, those verbs not being of the same person, and not of the same number, and not having the same subject. Our position was, that verbs used as in this case, where one verb is of the second person and plural number imperative, and the other of the third person singular imperative, that they were frequently used in connection as there used, while they had not two subjects, but one, that there is but one subject with both verbs. We called attention to some plays recorded in Euripides where this is true, as well as to the rule in grammar where this fact is recognized. I come to the passage under consideration; and probably I do not know how to pronounce Greek—I say, that possibly; but I guess I will pronounce it so that those who understand Greek will know what I mean, at any rate.

Now, then, we take the passage: In 1st Corinthians xiv. 37, the first verb that appears is *zeeloute*. We state, that this verb is of the second person, plural number, and imperative. Put that down in your book; for, if Brother Ray is a scholar, he will have to look over his Greek again, notwithstanding all his scholarship. Brother Cook never told him that there is but one verb imperative here, I will venture to say. But I call the attention of every scholar in the house to what I state, and we will see whether my friend is correct. The second verb employed is *kooluete*. We state, that this verb is of the second person, plural in number, imperative. Here are two verbs where my friend said there is only one. Here are two verbs quoted of the second person, plural number, imperative.* We will give you another, *ginesthoo*. Here is another verb in the same passage that we quoted last night (and I guess I can pronounce it so that Brother Cook can understand what I am talking about, whether my friend can or not) which is the third verb employed in the passage; and now we state that this verb is of the third person, singu-

* *Dr. Lucas made a mistake. These verbs are not in the 37th verse: They are in the 39th and 40th verses.*—D. B. RAY.

lar number, and imperative. Here are three verbs in the passage, two of them of the second person, plural number, and imperative, and the last one of the third person singular imperative. We are willing to stop talking in this controversy whenever we are convicted of wrong on this subject. We do not claim to be scholarly; but we are perfectly willing to surrender the whole point when you convict me of error in regard to these verbs in this passage. We will just yield the whole point whenever we are convicted of error upon this point, and say we are not qualified to go on with the discussion, and we will give the gentleman a chance to show his scholarship and great ability.

In the 16th chapter of 1st Corinthians and 13th verse, the first verb in the passage is *greegoreite;* this verb is of the second person, plural number and imperative. The next verb in the passage is *steekete,* that is of the second person, plural number and imperative. The third verb is *krataiousthe,* and this verb is of the third person, plural and imperative. The next verb is *ginesthoo,* of the third person singular imperative. When it is stated that these verbs are precisely the same, we say that two of the verbs are of the same person, plural number and imperative; while the other two are of the third person, one of them plural and imperative, and the other of the third person singular imperative. Convict us of error in regard to these verbs, if you can, and, again, we say, we will surrender the point. We are willing to risk what we state in regard to these verbs, we are willing to risk all that can be said against our position by the learned gentleman, by my learned friend from Lexington, Kentucky, Brother Ray—for his counsellors last night led him into difficulty. So much for Greek criticism for the present.

But, "succession" again. He is determined to have that up, and to talk about that, and while he attempts to reply to Dr. Lucas, he gets up and runs the whole round, again and

again—the same thing every time. I am not especially sensitive upon that point. What I have to say, the audience hear, and they will decide that question. But, he starts out with succession, succession, succession, and succession, and that has been the great question from the beginning to the present time, and, of course, he has given you something new every time. He does not talk about the same thing. No! no! He has a large fund of knowledge on hand, that he can give you something new every time. Succession, and Campbell, and Lard, Campbell and Lard, Lard and Campbell, that is something new every time. Well, give us something new again, Brother Ray, when you get up, tell us about suceession, Campbell and Lard, Lard and Campbell. [Laughter.]

But, the foundation—the foundation again. One argument that we brought against his church was, that it was not founded upon the Bible foundation, and we called attention to the quotation where it is said to have been founded upon a principle, and also to Wayland's "Principles and Practices of the Baptists," where their worship and rules of discipline were founded and arranged according to the principles embodied in the foundation, and where Dr. Wayland says, "the Baptist church is a sect among other sects." While he says that Dr. Wayland states that "the New Testament is our only creed." Now, I state that there is not a Protestant church in the land but says, "We take the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice." Yet, we know that every single one of them has a creed and confession of faith and discipline. Well, it may be that is the idea that Dr. Wayland had of the matter. He takes the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice, yet the Baptists are capable, according to the principles that serve as the basis of their establishment, of forming their own rules of worship and discipline.

With regard to succession, we call your attention to a passage or two again, for we have to talk about this as long

as the gentleman, for he is leading and we are following; he is affirming, we are replying. On page 188, of the "Religious Encyclopedia"—we are quoting from Baptists—and we invite attention to what they say upon this subject: "Innumerable volumes have been written under the title of Church History, but, after all, we know but very little of the real church of Christ for many hundred years. We have very ample account of the Antichristian church, that false pretender, in unhallowed alliance *with the kings of the earth, and drunken with the blood of the saints;* but the history of the uncorrupted church, which maintained the worship and ordinances of Christ while *all the world was wondering after the beast,* is enveloped in obscurity, in the obscurity of that retreat *which God prepared for her in the wilderness.*" Here, for several hundred years, he says, we have no reliable history of the church, but its history is enveloped in the obscurity attending the people of God while in the wilderness. That is the statement of this Baptist authority. We call your attention to another statement, found on page 1149: "For, after all, an uninterrupted succession, however gratifying it may be to be able to trace it, is necessary only to the church which regulates its practices by tradition, and not by the word of God." Now, were we to admit it according to Benedict and Robinson, but my friend says that Robinson does not deny the succession. Suppose he does not? Robinson says that the succession—and Benedict quotes it as we have read time and again in your hearing—is necessary only for that church that relies upon tradition and not upon the word of God, and consequently whether it be true or false, whether he denies or admits it, amounts to nothing in the settlement of the question before us. Further, in regard to the foundation. We state that Jesus became the foundation after he was tried, and then the stone which the builders rejected became the head of the corner. He was tried by the temptation of Satan; he was tried by his

poverty; he was tried by his suffering in the garden; he was tried by his suffering at Pilate's bar; he was tried by his suffering upon the cross; and, consequently, as he entered not into the foundation as a tried stone till after he was tried, as the gentleman says his church was established and built before that time, it could not be upon this foundation, therefore the gentleman is wrong in regard to the foundation. But again, in Ephesians, where it is affirmed that the middle wall of partition was taken away by Jesus nailing it to the cross; and after that the one new man, one new church, was built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I will simply make a proposition to the Dr., and that is, to leave the settlement of the Greek criticism to those who are known to be Greek scholars in this community. I will simply state, however, that his first word *Zēloute* is not in the passage referred to. I believe it is two or three verses below; and then the other words that he referred to have no particular connection—I mean they are not parallel verbs to those used in Acts ii. 38—not connected by the conjunction in order to procure the same result—nothing like it—and I state that his criticism is entirely wrong. *Epiginōsketō* is found there, it is true, and is in the singular number. But the word—1st Cor. xvi. 13—that he mentioned there as in the second person plūral—

MR. LUCAS—Tell us what it is?

MR. RAY—*Grēgoreite.* That is about as good as you can do. [Laughter.] But then, again, the other verbs in the other two lines are all in the second person, plural number, and not connected like those in Acts ii. 38. If I state it incorrectly, I will let it go into the record, but I am going to have the testimony of scholars upon this point, I do not care to have it stand upon my own assertion. If the gentleman wants me to pronounce these Greek words, I think, my dear friends, that I can pronounce them as well as he did, and so I am satisfied. I wish him to give lessons in Greek. Let him pronounce Greek for the rising generation of students in this community. Go on, and give us lessons in the language.

But the Dr. says Orchard does not testify, as I supposed. Well, I never found but one man, I believe, before, that put such a construction upon that language of Cardinal Hosius, and I do not think that he knew very much about history and the construction of language. Cardinal Hosius says, as I have already quoted from Orchard, p. 364: "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinions and persuasions of *no sect can be truer* or surer than those of the ANABAPTISTS; since there have been none for *these twelve hundred years past* that have been more grievously punished."

But, the gentleman says I have got him deeper and deeper into confusion. I told you that blindness had happened to my friend, in regard to the Baptists, consequently it is impossible for me to open his eyes; and the more light I throw upon him, the more it seems to obscure his vision. He can not understand it; and yet, sir, I do not believe we have an intelligent freedman in all the South, but what would know who the Baptists are, if you were to ask him. I do not believe there is a man or woman so unintelligent in all this region round about, but could tell, if I were to ask the denomination with which my worthy Brother Cook is connected. Also, the college, of high repute, of which he is president, belongs to the same denomination. And yet Dr. Lucas can not tell for the life of him who the Baptists are!!! I was not so ignorant concerning his church. I knew exactly what it was, and I was prepared to give him a lesson or two on some points connected with it myself. *But he does not know!* How gross is his darkness upon that subject. He is *very learned* in the *Greek*, you know. I am glad of that; I am going to learn Greek as we go along; I am going to commence the study of it now.

I remark, in regard to the Baptists, that in history they are

simply known as Baptists; and common people, with common intelligence, never had any difficulty in finding out who they were, but a great man, like the Dr., can not get down to the information on that subject. All the names that have been used here have been applied to us by persons that wanted to distinguish some of the brethren, for various causes, from each other. The gentleman has got a dozen names, and he imagines there are a dozen Baptist denominations. That's what is the matter with him. When his people are called *Disciples* by some, suppose I had said that is one denomination; then there are the *Reformers*—well, that is another. Now, which do you belong to, Dr. Lucas? Here are "Reformers," "Disciples," and "Christians," and I can not tell, for the life of me, which church you belong to. Suppose I had said this, dear friends. It seems to me it is quibbling. Here is a denomination outnumbering any denomination in America, outside of Romanism—a denomination whose missionaries are in all the countries of the earth; whose influence is shaking the thrones of the old world, and yet, a representative of an enlightened denomination, standing up here, don't know anything about it! I do confess, my dear friends, that I am a little ashamed of the Dr. on that subject. Now, on every other subject, he certainly is very learned—especially Greek!

But he says I admitted succession is not necessary. No, sir; I have admitted that the proof of the succession, from the uninspired historic standpoint, is not essential to our church identity; and if you have kept up the connection of that argument, you will find that I have constructed an argument that if I sustain a succession from the inspired historic standpoint I prove all the rest, because I have proved that the gentleman's church has no succession, only to Alexander Campbell, about forty-six years ago; and I have shown that the Pedobaptist churches obtain their succession from Rome; that

the Roman Catholic church is the great Antichrist; and there is but one church that has the succession; therefore it falls to the Baptists' by inheritance, because no other Church has it. That is the argument. It belongs to one church; it can not belong to Rome, or any of its branches; It does not belong to the gentleman's church, because that is of too recent origin; therefore it falls to us by inheritance. There is no escape from that argument. I defy the powers of earth to refute it. That is what I made the argument for. You see where it begins to pinch a little. I wish your attention to that argument. I wish to bring it to bear that my friend may see its force.

Why don't he answer those questions that I have asked? I asked him when the church died; when it became extinct; when it was buried; when it was resurrected. Has God's word failed? I put him in direct antagonism to God's eternal word. He says: *I will admit the succession; I will admit the Baptists had a succession all the time; yet I don't believe it!* Will you get me to contradict myself before this people in that way? Did you ever catch me in any such snap as that? I want you to admit it without mental reservation, with all your heart and soul, mind and strength, or else show me that the proofs are insufficient. Examine the testimony to show that Campbell is false, to show that Ypeij and Dermont are false; but don't inform the people that you admit the succession, but don't believe it! This question is not going to be passed by as easily as you now suppose.

But, "Ray went to Illinois to kill Campbellism." Who said so? I never did. I never heard any of my brethren say so. I suppose that the Campbellites got scared over there, fearing that I was going to kill them! And the Dr. learned that I had said I wanted to get all the wisdom of Campbellism into one man, and then I was going to kill the animal. I did not say it. Somebody has made a mistake.

But some persons at Blandinville told me that Dr. Lucas was one of the most learned men in the denomination. One brother of the Dr. told me that he was the only man that had the ability to discuss the question. That is the reason it took them a month to get a man. They selected Dr. Lucas. Some of the brethren said: "What can you do with the man? he is so able. How are you going to meet him? Dr. Lucas is such a great man in debate." "Indeed," said I to some of the brethren, "I am glad to hear it. If all the wisdom in that church were combined in one man, it could not be proved that the church which Alexander Campbell set up is the church of Christ, no more than they can prove that Alexander Campbell is Jesus Christ." I did not talk about comparing my wisdom. But suppose you have all the wisdom in that church in one cranium, and then let that man undertake to prove that a man forty-five years old is Jesus Christ, the veritable Jesus Christ, and he could not do it, could he? That is just the point I was making. Your informant missed the figure. You ought not to tell every little report you hear, unless you know more about it, any how, because it may get you into trouble.

But, then, I must give you a little more succession. The succession troubles the gentleman very much. The charge is sometimes made that the Baptists originated recently; I say by men that do not understand it, men who are ignorant of our history. I wish now to quote the testimony of a learned work prepared by Wm. H. Hall, Esq., quoted in Trilemma, p. 137, which was begun in London in 1788, and completed in three large folio volumes. This Encyclopedia says: "It is to be remarked that the Baptists, or Mennonites, in England and Holland, are to be considered in a very different light from the enthusiasts we have been describing; and it appears equally uncandid and invidious to trace up their distinguished sentiments, as some of their adversaries have done, to those obnox-

ious characters, and then to stop, in order, as it were, to associate with it the ideas of turbulence and fanaticism, with which it certainly has no natural connection. Their coincidence with some of those oppressed and infatuated people, in denying baptism to infants, is acknowledged by the Baptists, but they disavow the practice which the appellation of Anabaptist implies; and their doctrines seem referable to a more ancient and respectable origin. They appear supported by history in considering themselves the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Romish hierarchy." This is the testimony of those who are not Baptists. The learned writer in this Encyclopedia says that the sentiments of the Baptists and their history are referable to the ancient Waldenses that were persecuted in the olden time for the faith as delivered to the saints. I design to call your attention, before I sit down, to the testimony of an historian, George Waddington, the author of a book called "The History of the Church"—a learned Episcopalian. On p. 70: "In regard to Novatian, Mr. Waddington said: "We consider the Christian church as a society where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and refused any longer to acknowledge as members of it those who had once degenerated into unrighteousness. This endeavor to revive the spotless purity of the primitive faith was found inconsistent with the corruptions of even that early age; it was regarded with suspicion by the early prelates, as a vain and visionary scheme, and those rigid principles, which had characterized and sanctified the church in the first century, were abandoned to the profession of schismatic sectaries in the third.

"From a review of what has been written on this subject, some truths may be derived of considerable historical importance, the following among them: 1st. In the midst of perpetual dissent and occasional controversy, a steady and dis-

tinguishable line, both in doctrine and practice, was maintained by the early church," &c. This shows that even prior to what is called the Novatian rupture by historians, that the line in faith and practice had been steadily preserved, and that those denominated by Waddington heretics and schismatics, and so considered by the church of Rome, held the original faith of the church in its purity; it was Rome that departed from the faith, and not those that were then denominated Novatians.

But, now, again, in regard to the succession of the church. I call attention to some of the statements of the learned Mosheim, Church History, p. 491: "It may be observed, in the first place, that the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, many persons, who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites, had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner, viz: 'That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.'" Here we have the testimony of this very learned historian; although bitterly prejudiced against the Baptists, yet he is forced to testify that they are not mistaken entirely when they boast of their origin from those ancient witnesses of the truth, witnesses for God." Then again, on p. 490, he says: "The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of

Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in the depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained." Instead of doing as some of the enemies of the persecuted Baptists have done, attributing their origin to "John Menno," he says their origin is hid in the depths of antiquity, and tracing them back he leaves them, showing that he fails to find a human head, a human origin for the Baptists. I defy the powers of men on earth, or the powers of *hades* to tell the founder of the Baptists, this side of Jesus Christ. I wish the gentleman, when he denies our proposition, to come squarely up and meet the issue. Our position stands unmoved, while the representative champions of his church deny that we are the church of Christ, yet, dear friends, all the church succession they ever had in the way of baptism came from those that are excluded from our fellowship—every bit of it; and if we are Antichrist or Babylon, they got their baptism from Antichrist or from Babylon, and are they any better? Do you not see the difficulty he has gotten himself into in this proposition? He has not studied history, and no wonder he reads, and stops, and hesitates, and then tells what he has done, like the boy whistling in the graveyard, to keep his spirits up.

But now, then, in regard to other testimony: I call your attention, just at this point, as I shall come to it directly, to very important testimony in regard to the sufferings of the Baptists. Before I do this, however, I want your attention again to the fact (and I will advance, and let him rest on the succession, or this part of it, for a little while), that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics of having no head except Jesus Christ, no leader except him. They do not point to some great man, and. when some man talks about our princi-

ples, say that Alexander Campbell is our head and leader, or John Wesley is our leader. No; we point back up the stream of time to the Nazarene on Calvary's cross, and say, Jesus is the founder of his own church, Jesus is our head; and through long centuries they were called the *Acephali*. I suppose the gentleman understands that; he is a Greek scholar. That means, the *headless*. Because Baptists had no head, no human head, like the hierarchies, they were denominated the *headless church*. They had but one head, and that was Jesus Christ. And, in this connection, I will quote a passage (Desilver's Religious Denominations in Great Britain and America, p. 51): "The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church, in whom, by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order, or government of the church is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner." The Baptist Manual says: "We acknowledge no founder but Christ."

But, now, we call upon the Dr., and plead with him to answer our questions. I will try to answer his questions, and if I can not it will be because I do not know how. If I fail to do it, it is because the flesh is weak. Now, Dr., please answer me, *Who was the founder of the Baptist Church*, if Christ was not? When you ask me who the founder of your church is, I will tell you. You can talk eloquently upon the construction of the Greek language, but I wish you to tell this people where the Baptists started. I want you to tell this people, and those who are to come after—shall I say, future generations, perhaps generations unborn, when my head is asleep under the sod (for then this question may be asked)—*who founded the Baptist Church!* ECHO ANSWERS, WHO? Dr., I want this people to know that it was JESUS of Nazareth, the Son of the most high God. The Baptist Church is the church of *the living God, because it was founded by Jesus Christ!*

But, now we come to another important argument, in my

line, showing that the Baptist is the church of Christ, *because it is the martyr church.* The passage he has quoted, I will quote again—Dan. vii. 21—the papal horn that grew upon the head of the ten-horned and seven-headed beast—that "youngest horn"—as Mr. Campbell denominates it—"of Daniel's sea monster, that spoke great swelling words against God. It had a mouth, and eyes, and wisdom; and it is said, "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them." But in the very same chapter and 27th verse, it says, the "kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." Not against the kingdom, but against the saints—members of the church, did the little horn prevail, during the long and dreary ages—1260 years.

Revelations xvii. 6, there we find: "The women drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." That great Babylonish harlot—that false church, called Babylon, which rode upon the bloody beast—was drunk with the blood of the saints, and my friend says that those saints were in Babylon. Then she was drunk with the blood of her own members! Is there any reason in such an argument? Do you mean that the Catholics were murdering their own members—drunk with the blood of their own members? They could not have been *martyrs of Jesus*, when they were symbolizing with Antichrist and were guilty of idolatry. If so, they were not *witnesses* for God. *Martyr!* Look and see what martyr means. You will find it to be witness. They were witnesses for Christ—along those dark and dreary ages—for the church of the living God. And I want your attention to the testimony of a very learned historian—a Catholic—Louis Cormenin. In his history of the Popes, part 2, p. 197, he says: "In Germany it was still worse, the reformed, moved by religious fanaticism, pursued the sect of the Anabaptists with the utmost rigor, and exercisied such frightful cruelties toward them, that the hair rises on the head when

we read the recitals that historians have given us. Instead of being intimidated by tortures, these new martyrs surrendered themselves to their executioners; they were seen mounting the funeral piles, singing the praises of God; the most delicate females sought the most cruel torments, to give proof of their faith; young virgins walked to punishment more gaily than to the nuptial ceremony; the men evinced not the least signs of fear, when contemplating the terrible instruments of torture; they sang psalms while the executioners were tearing off their flesh with red hot pinchers. Even when their bodies were half consumed by the fire, their members broken, and the skin torn from their skulls, was hanging about their shoulders, they exhorted the assistants to become converts to their doctrine. Never had any sect shown such extraordinary constancy in persecutions; thus, the admiration which their courage inspired, drew a great number of Catholics and Lutherans into their ranks. If the excellency of a religion could be proved by the testimony and number of its martyrs, as the Catholic priests maintain, the sect of the Anabaptists would, doubtless, be superior to any other, since it had, in less than a year, more than a hundred and fifty thousand martyrs, which is more than the martyrologists count during the long persecutions of the Pagan emperors." Here, then, is the authority of a learned Catholic writer. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' FOURTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My friend certainly was very considerably excited during the speech that you have just heard, and one would suppose that he was a little out of humor. There is certainly something that has taken possession of the gentleman when he can get down to talking about "Africans," and the "weakest Africans," and so on. It may be possible I am rather dark complected, and my appearance may have suggested the thing to him. I don't know; but I recollect he told me, in Blandinville, his mother said he was a very pretty and handsome boy. Well, he is not to blame, is he? He is a very pretty boy. He has held his own, has he not? Now, just look at him; don't you think he is pretty? [Laughter.] He is certainly very handsome. No doubt, if his mother were here she might say, "Well, my son, you were the prettiest boy I ever saw, and you are certainly handsome and beautiful yet." However, some of you may say, he may have been a pretty boy. As the women generally say, "pretty boys make very ugly men." They might look at it in that light, that he had changed, and verified the truth of that statement.

Well, he says, I have admitted a succession, and denied it. I said, for the sake of argument, as it was not necessary to establish a succession, or to prove a succession, in order to identify the church, as Benedict says; and, in order that you may have that matter before your minds, I will read again what Benedict says, as he is a Baptist authority. He says:

"I shall not attempt to trace a continuous line of churches, as we can for a few centuries (51st page) past in Europe and America. That is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim, and, of course, we make no effort to prove it. We place no kind of reliance on this kind of testimony to establish the soundness of our faith, or the validity of our administration." That is what Benedict says upon that subject.

My friend says some one told him, at Blandinville, that I was the only one qualified, in all the country, to meet the great giant from Lexington. Well, I do not know what any one may have told him there in regard to that matter. I am very certain if any one intimated anything of the kind to the gentleman, that he claimed more for me than I ever claimed for myself; that is, so far as personal superiority on my own part is concerned. I have never made any claim of that kind. But he says he waited, still he waited some time, when I was confined to my room, sick in my bed, and not able to be up for days. He waited, in consequence, as I am credibly informed, by some of our brethren giving him five dollars per day, for several days, to wait. That is why he waited, according to my information. They hired him to wait, when I was sick in bed. I should not have referred to this matter at all, had not the gentleman referred to it in the way in which he did. He talked about waiting such a long time, when he was hired to wait, at least a part of the time, and that by my brethren, to the tune of five dollars a day.

He speaks of Mr. Campbell and his associates being excluded from the Baptist church. I simply deny that they were excluded from the Baptists, and challenge the gentleman to prove it.

But he wants to know in regard to the head of his church. Well, I say most positively that Jesus Christ is not its head. Now, it is for the gentleman to prove his proposition, that Je-

sus is the head of the Baptist church. I say, in the days of Jesus, and for hundreds of years after Jesus established his church, for hundreds of years there was no such thing in history, or anywhere else, as the Baptist church, and I challenge him to prove that Jesus Christ is the head of the Baptist church. I deny it. Let him prove it.

We proceed to notice his argument in regard to the martyr church. I call your attention again to this passage, or these passages, to which reference has been made. The argument, as I understood the gentleman, in regard to the 2d of Acts was, that the verbs could not have the same nominative or subject, because the verb repent was of the second person, plural number, and that the verb *baptisthato* is in the third person and singular number; both verbs are in the imperative, the one plural, and the other singular; one of the second person, and the other of the third. Now, we have furnished cases to show that very frequently, not only among the classics, but in the New Testament Scriptures, and I might furnish others, where we have verbs plural in number, of the second person, imperative, and verbs of the third person, singular number, and imperative, where those verbs have the same subject. I gave you the verbs in the 14th chapter, but he states that the verbs I gave you are not found in the verse I mentioned. I just differ again with the gentleman. I say they are, every one of them.* The first passage, 1st Corinthians xiv. 37—every one of them I gave is found right there in that passage, and not only so, but precisely as I gave it; and in the 13th verse of the 16th chapter, we have the other verbs we gave as in that verse, and we state that the two first were in the second person, plural number, and imperative; that the third verb presented in the passage was of the third person plural imperative; and that *ginesthō*, the last one mentioned in the passage, was of the third person singular imperative. Now, I made this statement, that it is not neces-

* I made a mistake in the verses. It is 1st Cor. xiv. 39, 40; and 1st Cor. xvi. 13. —J. R. Lucas.

sary for us to talk all night in regard to this question, for it can be settled. I say, in regard to the verbs in these passages, that they have the same subject—those verbs of the second person, and of the third person. We say, they have the same subject, and I am perfectly willing to leave the issue of that matter to scholars. Consequently, we will leave the matter there for the present, and let scholars decide upon the question for themselves. It is just as I have stated. He says of this second passage that there is no verb of the third person, and consequently is neither in the second passage or in the first. We want to have the issue clearly understood. The statement is, that in the first, that one of the verbs I used is not in the passage, and that we have not either second person plural imperative, or third person singular imperative; that is, in regard to the first passage. The first statement was this, that there is but one verb there. And, then, in the second passage, that they are all of the same person and number, and imperative, in the second passage. That is his statement. Now, I say the gentleman is mistaken; and I am willing to leave it to scholars to decide who is correct upon the subject, and for the present, therefore, we will leave it.

He says the Baptist church is the martyr church. What does he mean by that? Does he mean that the Baptist church is the only church where any of its members have suffered martyrdom! Does he not know that there are numbers of churches that have suffered persecution, where their members have shown their fidelity to their organization, and the sincerity of their hearts in regard to their position religiously, by sealing that sincerity with their blood? Does he not know this? And if it proves anything in favor of the Baptist church, it proves as much with regard to any other church that has had its history marked by the blood of its martyrs; and, consequently, instead of proving that the Baptist church is the church of Christ, he simply proves, if the

argument is worth anything, that there are several churches of Jesus Christ.

He speaks about the Baptist church again. Well, I simply state that I thought I had disposed of that matter. These Particular Baptists, and General Baptists, and Old Connection and New Connection and Seventh-Day Baptists, are separate organizations, and they have independent associations, and they do not fraternize with each other—they do not enter into communion or fellowship in a church relation with each other. But he told you that Jesus Christ is the head of the Baptist church. I ask you, did he prove it? Did he prove that Jesus Christ is the head of the Baptist church? He made his statement, and he left the matter with you, and we must receive it upon his statement. Well, he may be a very good man; he may know a great deal; he may be a very beautiful man, and all that kind of thing, and yet his testimony we receive not in a case of this kind. We want other testimony than that of friend Ray. He is an interested witness, an *ex parte* witness in this case, and we want higher authority. We state again, that in the days of Jesus Christ, and for hundreds of years, history is as silent as the night of the grave with regard to the Baptist church. There was no such thing as the Baptist church. History does not declare the existence for hundreds of years of such a church. Yet, the church that Jesus established was the Baptist church, and Jesus its head. So says my friend.

We have presented arguments to show that his position with regard to the foundation of his church is opposed to the Bible, that it is not the Bible foundation. We deny his position with regard to Jesus being the head of his church, and we ask you, has he given you a scintilla of evidence in favor of the affirmation? He has not, and he can not. We have presented certain arguments against the claims of the gentleman's church, while we have tried to notice those presented by him,

as succession, the foundation of his church, the head of his church, and the martyrs. We have shown you that there is no conclusive evidence in regard to his proposition from those sources, which verify the truth of his statement. We have submitted a number of arguments, and now add a fourth against the claims of the gentleman's church. We state that their theory of man's moral nature is wrong, and consequently the Baptist church founded upon that theory is wrong. What is the theory with regard to man's moral nature? Mr. Jeter, and Mr. Williams, and the gentleman's church as a body affirm that man is totally depraved—that he is corrupt in every faculty of his soul and member of his body, so that by virtue of his inherited corruption he can not think a good thought, he can not do a good deed; that he is opposed to all good and prone to all evil, and that continually; that he can not, without the miraculous influence and energy of the Holy Spirit brought to bear upon him, come to Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God. It is not simply the operation of the Spirit through the word of God, but being thus corrupt man is so destitute of all power and of all ability as that it takes the supernatural influence and power of the Holy Spirit in order to enable him to come. We state, if this theory be correct, then the conversion of the sinner is as great a miracle as ever has been performed since creation. Since the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy, no greater miracle has been performed than the conversion of every sinner, for it requires the supernatural operation of the Spirit in order to convert him and enable him to come to the Saviour. When we come to investigate the word of God, I ask you, what is the truth upon this question. Jesus looked (as recorded in Matt. xxiii.) upon Jerusalem, the once highly favored city, where the Shekinah had often appeared, where the glory of God had been manifested, through the Jewish high priests, in that mighty temple erected in honor of the God of

Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob. What does the Saviour say? What were the feelings of his great heart, as he looked upon Jerusalem? He exclaims: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not." And, again, in Matthew's record xi. 28, Jesus stands before the people and says: "Come unto me, all *ye* that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." The Saviour seems to talk as though they had power to come, and the reason why they did not enjoy this blessedness and this honor, was not because they could not come to him, but because they would not. Again, the Saviour says in the 5th chapter of John? "You will not," not that "you can not," "You will not come to me, that you might have life." This is the language of the Saviour. He throws the responsibility upon the individual himself—he recognizes his power and his ability to come, and says the reason why he does not enjoy life is because he will not come. In the last chapter of the Revelation made to John, the beloved disciple, while upon the Isle of Patmos, we have these words presented: "And the Spirit and the bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." I ask you, what is the force of all his declarations? I ask you, is it not to impress the mind that the reason why you are not in the enjoyment of the blessedness here presented to your view is that you will not come, and submit to the terms upon which this blessedness is offered, and not because you can not come. We say, therefore, that the gentleman's church is not the church of Jesus Christ, because it is wrong in this particular as in the others that have already been mentioned. It stands

opposed to the teaching of the word of God, wrong in theory, and consequently wrong in practice, and in the plan of conversion founded upon that theory.

We not only state that his church is wrong in regard to its theory of man's moral nature, by which man is held to be thus corrupt, thus depraved, totally and entirely, in every faculty of the soul and every member of the body; but we submit, in connection, the fifth argument—wrong in the theory and practice of conversion. They are wrong; first, as already indicated, they are wrong in the operations of the Holy Spirit, in conversion, teaching that it is immediate; that it is supernatural in its nature and character, and that this power is exerted immediately upon the sinner's heart, independently of the word of God. But we state, secondly, in regard to their theory of the plan of conversion. They are not only wrong upon the subject of the Spirit's operations, but they are wrong on the subject of justification by faith. With my friend it is faith alone—that is the doctrine of his church —faith alone, faith only. Well, the word of God teaches as clearly as language can teach, that faith alone is dead, dead as the body without the spirit is dead; that faith alone is not the faith by which we are justified, and by which we are brought into fellowship and in communion with God, our Heavenly Father. We have quoted a number of passages in your hearing, in order to demonstrate this fact. We stated that we are said not to be saved by faith only, but it is affirmed that in obeying the form of doctrine delivered, that we are made free from sin, and become servants of righteousness, and the apostle James, in his first chapter of his letter and the 25th verse of the chapter, says: "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." Here we have the perfect law of liberty presented; and it is called the perfect law of liberty,

because men are liberated and made free from sin, when they properly submit to the requirements of this perfect law of liberty; and whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed. He shall be blessed with that liberty presented in this perfect law. We have not only this passage, but we call your attention to the declaration made by the apostle Peter, as found in the 22d verse of the 1st chapter of his letter. Here we have it affirmed: "Seeing you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, *see that ye* love one another with a pure heart fervently." They purified their souls, according to Peter, in obeying the truth through the Spirit. This is the declaration of the apostle Peter. The gentleman will concede that this purification is necessary to salvation and pardon, and if they enjoy this purification, by obeying the truth through the Spirit, then more than simple faith is required to the enjoyment of the blessing here presented, and we state that this obedience to the truth is obedience to the gospel, to the Son of God, and in proof of the fact, we simply follow the apostle further in what he here presents. In the 24th verse of the same chapter to the close. What is called "truth" in the 22d v., he calls in the 24th v., "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." However, we read on, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh *is* as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." The truth is the word, the word is the gospel, and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S FIFTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: While it is on my mind, I wish to call your attention to the last part of my friend's argument. He referred to Romans vi. 17—that when they *obeyed from the heart* that form of doctrine delivered unto them, they were made free from this law of sin and death; and he said this obedience, or *obeying the gospel,* was not simply faith, or faith only, but faith and something else.

I wish you to mark the gentleman's doctrine, that where *obeying from the heart* is mentioned in the Bible, the Disciples imagine that baptism is understood. That is just what he is aiming at; and I wish your attention to some Scriptures bearing upon that subject—Romans x. 16, 17: "But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Thus it appears that Paul understood by *obeying the gospel,* believing the gospel report; so that obedience from the heart is the exercise of faith in Christ, which results in external obedience as the fruits of righteousness. It is said in the letter to the Ephesians ii. 10: We are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Thus we are saved by grace, not of works, but *by grace;* not of yourselves; it is the *gift of God.* Then, again, to show that he is mistaken in regard to what is meant by *obeying the gospel,* we turn to 2d Thessalonians i. 7-10: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels,

in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." This proves, positively, that all who fail to *believe the gospel* will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. Will the gentleman affirm that all the Anabaptists are thus to be *punished with everlasting destruction?* If his argument is worth anything, then all the *unimmersed* must go down to the devil's hell! and this is the legitimate conclusion from the gentleman's doctrine; it is the doctrine of eternal damnation of all the unimmersed. That is where he places himself before this enlightened audience.

But, my notes of his speech. I thought my worthy friend could get along in *this* discussion without attempting to impugn my motives, and make me out a poor, driveling—. I was going to use a hard word—not against him, but myself. He attempts to impugn my motives, accusing me of pecuniary motives, as though I had been paid by contract to wait for him, being hired by his brethren. I will simply read, without comment, some papers on that subject, perhaps tomorrow evening, and then leave the Dr. in his glory. But I will tell you the reason why he noticed this, in my judgment, and that is, because he did not have anything else to say. He was out of material just at that point.

I deny, said he, that we were excluded from the Baptists. Well, he denies a great many things; but, then, he ought certainly to bring more proof on some points. On page 97 of Jeter's work on Campbellism we have a report of the learned and able committee appointed by the Dover Association, in regard to Mr. Campbell's disciples and their doc-

trines, in which they say: "We, therefore, the assembled ministers and delegates of the Dover Association, after much prayerful deliberation, do hereby affectionately recommend to the churches in our connection to separate from their communion all such persons as are promoting controversy and discord under the specious name of 'Reformers.' That the line of distinction may be clearly drawn, so that all who are concerned may understand it, we feel it our duty to declare, that whereas Peter Ainslie, John Du Val, Matthew W. Webber, Thomas H. Henley, John Richards, and Dudley Atkinson, ministers within the bounds of this Association, have voluntarily assumed the name of 'Reformers,' in its party application, by attending a meeting publicly advertised for that party, and communing with and otherwise promoting the views of the members of that party, who have been separated from the fellowship and communion of the regular Baptist churches; therefore

"*Resolved*, That this Association can not consistently and conscientiously receive them, nor any other ministers maintaining their views, as members of their body; nor can they in the future act in concert with any church or churches that may encourage or countenance their ministers."

On page 100 of Jeter on Campbellism, Mr. Campbell complains of their exclusion thus: "How will they answer to the Lord for casting out of his church on earth (as they call the Dover Association) those whom they have every reason to think are esteemed as much the children of God as themselves?" They did not call the Dover Association a church. Mr. Campbell was mistaken upon that point; but they advised the churches to *cast the Disciples out*, and they did do it; they did it, and I have here the testimony. But I do not wish to waste my time reading it. The gentleman did not deny it in his proposition, and now he comes up and denies it when I am in the affirmative. Previous to this, when I

brought the matter up, he has been as silent as the grave,—there was no voice of denial; but now, when I am in the affirmative, and have something else to do, he gets up and denies it. He ought to have denied it at the right time.

Well, then, he emphatically denies the headship of the Baptist church; but now it does behoove him to show who else set it up, and when he does that he has sustained his denial. Let him find the man. When I say a denomination has been set up by human authority, I feel under obligations to find and introduce the proof; I must name the man, and tell the date of its organization.

Well, now, I answer that *argument* (?) about my appearance, my looks and all that, by just saying that I surmise the Dr. brought this out because he wished to advertise his own beauty! Well, I never professed to be very handsome, and I do not believe that will prove or disprove the proposition.

But, the Dr. says, the Baptists have the wrong theory of conversion. I wish to know who of his church believes it, because they receive the converts from Baptists without requiring anything more of them. Suppose I desired to get into his church; well, I come forward and say, "Dr. Lucas, I wish to unite with you. I give you my hand; will you take me?" "Brethren," the Dr. would say, "let us sing a song; let us give him the right hand of fellowship." That is all; and yet he is talking before this people to make them believe he does not think our conversion is right! while his folks will even receive those who have been excluded from Baptist fellowship, upon their Baptist conversion; therefore, his argument falls to the ground, and his own people do not believe a word of it. All the leaders of his denomination, the first that had their baptism—Mr. Campbell at the head—had their baptism from the Baptists, and that before they understood what they now call the design of baptism.

Again, the Dr. says, that we have wrong notions of man's moral nature as regards human depravity. I believe I will read you a little from the Scriptures upon this subject; Psalms li. 5: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." I suppose that David had reference to his moral nature. Then, again, Ps. lviii. commencing at the 2d verse: "Yea, in heart you work wickedness. You weigh the violence of your hands in the earth. The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent; they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear; which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely." He compares man's moral nature to *the deaf adder.* You may take the adder and nurse it, but it still has the poison, though it is not developed. The young adder has that undeveloped poison in his composition, and I do not care how you educate him, you may take him to your parlor and play with him, and do your best with him, but when he comes to be a full grown adder he will have the snakish disposition in spite of his education. That is the illustration the psalmist gives to illustrate man's moral condition, and yet the Dr. thinks by nature men are pure and holy!

Again, we refer you to another illustration, Ezekiel xxxvii. When the Lord carried Ezekiel into the midst of the valley of dry bones (I am going to quote this from memory), "And he said unto me, Son of Man, can these bones live?"—this valley of dead men's bones. The Dr. would have said "No, not a word of it." But Ezekiel said: "O Lord GOD, thou knowest." And the Lord tells him to prophesy to the dry bones, and Ezekiel commenced preaching, and suddenly he heard a *noise* and a *shaking* in the valley, and the bones came together, skin and flesh covered the bones, and there was a great army of men without life; and then he was commanded to prophesy to the wind and say: "O ye breath, come and breathe upon

these slain that they may live;" and then, when God caused the wind to breathe or blow upon them, there stood up an exceeding great army. We find in the 11th verse the application is made: "Then he said unto me: Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel; behold, they say, our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off from our parts." If Israel was compared to the valley of dry bones, I ask, what may be said of the fearful situation of men in their depravity. I might refer, while upon this point, to Acts xvi. 14: "It is said that a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard *us*, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." Here we have referred to that work of the Holy Spirit that my friend's church denies. "*Whose heart the Lord opened.*" Now, turn to Eph. i. 19: "And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set *him* at his own right hand in the heavenly *places.*" Then, again, in Eph. ii. 1: "And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins, wherein, in times past, ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom, also, we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." This proves that they were morally *dead*, and that *we even believe according to the workings of the mighty power which God brought to bear when he raised Jesus from the dead.* We are not wrong in drawing the Bible pictures. No, dear friends, men in a state of nature are said to be like the whited sepulchre: "the poison of asps is under their lips; they have not known the way of peace, even the best of men,

outwardly, while beautiful without, are inwardly *full* of corruption and the rottenness of dead men's bones." O! the sad work of sin; man *is lost*, and by nature without God, and without hope in the world. He is unable to save himself; he must cry to Jesus for salvation; nevertheless, when the gospel comes to him, he is accountable. All these beautiful passages we indorse fully, wherein Jesus said: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them;" and "ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life." They can not come except the Father *draws* them; but when they make the effort they have the power, so that every man is accountable, and can come by the aid of the Holy Spirit. So, then, it is by the aid of God he comes.

Again, I wish to say a little more in regard to *succession*, and the question of the perpetuity of the church. Lange, in his Commentary on 16th chapter of Matthew, 18th verse, says: "For a long time it seemed as if the church of Christ would become the prey of this destroying hades. But its gates *shall not ultimately prevail*—they shall be taken; and Christ will overcome and abolish the kingdom of death in his church. Of course the passage also implies conflict with the kingdom of evil, and victory over it; but its leading thought is the triumph of *life over death*, of the kingdom of the *resurrection* over the usurped reign of the kingdom of *hades*."

Again, *the martyr church*. The gentleman referred to the fact, that other denominations had suffered. But they did not suffer through that long reign of Anti-christ as the Baptists have. Some of those that came out from the church of Rome fought each other, and suffered more or less; and they persecuted others in their turn, when they had the power; but *the Baptists are the only denomination having an ancient existence, that has suffered persecution for dreary ages and have never retaliated by persecuting others*. I make this state-

ment, that the true church must be *the martyr church*—one that has furnished martyrs—witnesses who have died for the cause of Christ. I do not make this the only characteristic, but it is one of the characteristics; and when we find a church that has furnished no martyrs, it, we know, is not the true church of Christ. When we find a church that has furnished martyrs for its principles alone, and has no other points of identity, we know that it is not the true church of Christ; but when we find a church with the other characteristics, that has furnished the martyrs in the cause of Christ, that one we know to be the true church.

I want your attention now for one moment to the testimony of Theodore Beza, successor of Calvin, one of the ablest men of the sixteenth century. I quote from Jones' Church History, p. 264: "The Waldenses, time out of mind, have opposed the abuses of the church of Rome and have been persecuted after such a manner, not by the sword of the word of God, but by every species of cruelty, added to a million of calumnies and false accusations, that they have been compelled to disperse themselves wherever they could, wandering through the deserts like wild beasts. The Lord, nevertheless, has so preserved the residue of them, that, notwithstanding the rage of the whole world, they still inhabit three countries, at a great distance from each other, viz.: Calabria, Bohemia, Piedmont, and the countries adjoining, where they dispersed themselves from the quarters of Provence about 270 years ago. And, as to their religion, they never adhered to papal superstitions, for which they have been continually harassed by the bishops and inquisitors abusing the arm of secular justice, so that their continuance to the present time is evidently miraculous."

Along the dreary ages of the past the Baptist church has come through the storms of persecution, as I have read from the History of the Popes here, where one hundred and fifty

thousand fell beneath the fiendish power of persecution; and that from the Protestants in the times of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, I might call your attention to the testimony of Dr. Allix, in regard to these ancient Waldenses. He says: "Wherefore that I may once for all clear this matter, I say, first, that it is absolutely false that these churches were ever founded by Peter Waldo. Let them show us any author of that time who asserts Peter Waldo ever preached in the diocese of Italy, or that he founded any church there. Let him produce any sure tradition of that people referring the origin of their churches to Peter Waldo. Those who wrote at that time do not state anything like this, any more than they who lived after. Wherefore we must needs conclude it is a pure forgery to look on Waldo as the person who first brought the Reformation into Italy we now find there. I own, indeed, that Peter Waldo's taking care to have the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue, the churches of Italy reaped much benefit from that version, whereof we have to this day some old copies in the library of the University of Cambridge. But this does not, in the least, infer that Waldo ought to be considered the founder of them."

I say, further, by the acknowledgment of the enemies themselves of the Waldenses, it is absolutely false that these churches claimed an origin from Peter Waldo. The Waldenses, instead of claiming to be a reformation from Popery, claim to be the bride of Christ which fled into the wilderness from the face of the dragon. I need not quote further on this subject.

Just at this point I have one more testimony from the celebrated historian Geisler, regarding the Novatians, vol. 1, p. 163: "The Presbyter Novatian, at Rome, was dissatisfied at the choice of the Bishop Cornelius, A. D. 251, on account of his lenity toward the Lapsi. In the controversy which now ensued, Novatian, chiefly supported by the presbyter Novatus,

of Carthage, returned to the old principle, that those who have once fallen from the faith could in no case be received again. The church being divided by this schism, Novatian was chosen bishop by the one party in opposition to Cornelius. Though the other bishops, and especially Cyprian, at Carthage, and Dyonisius at Alexandria, were on the side of Cornelius, great numbers in all parts joined the stricter party." I might quote a great many other witnesses on this subject. I remark again, that the true church of Christ is the martyr church, and the Baptists have the honor of being the martyr church through the dark ages. This can not be consistently denied. I might refer to some of their sufferings in America. I will simply mention the conclusion of a speech that was delivered by one Mr. Wells, who belonged to the Puritan churches, so-called, of the New England States, when the Baptists were fined, in order to pay for the building of a meeting house for the Pedobaptists and support their preacher, who, because of their poverty, were unable to pay, and were driven into the wilderness, with mothers and children weeping; when Mr. Wells said, among other things, "that *the Baptists, for refusing to pay an orthodox minister, should be cut in pound pieces and boiled for their fat to grease the devil's carriage.*" This is found in the minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, and I will state to my friend that I have the 163d annual minutes of this association of Baptists, with whom we stand identified, numbering about 20,000 members. It has continued about 165 years as one of the associations of the denomination.

Again, I quote from Mosheim's Church History, p. 505: "There were certain sects and doctors, against whom the zeal, vigilance and severity of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists were united, and opposing whose settlement and progress these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous counsels and endeavors. The objects of

their common aversion were the Anabaptists, and those who denied the divinity of Christ and a trinity of persons in the Godhead." I might refer you to-night to the sufferings of our brethren in Virginia, where thirty Baptist ministers, before the Revolutionary War, were imprisoned in the Old Dominion simply for preaching the gospel. James Ireland was seized by the throat while holding a protracted meeting in a grove, and hurried away to prison; and when he wrote from Culpepper prison, he said: "my palace in Culpepper." And his enemies tried to kill him in prison; they attempted to suffocate him with burning brimstone, to blow him up with gunpowder, and in several ways to destroy him, but God preserved his life.

Old Brother Weatherford while in prison would hold his protracted meetings, and raise his stentorian voice in the dungeon, so that the people outside could have the gospel of salvation. I mention this to show that before the revolutionary struggle we had to suffer in our own land.

And there was Brother Holmes, who was tied to a stake and his back laid bare, and with the cruel lash he was whipped until he was not able to walk or stand. He had to bow down upon his knees to compose himself to sleep. Why? *Because he preached the gospel of the Son of God.* One of the most eloquent efforts of the great statesman Patrick Henry, was when he volunteered his services to go sixty miles to defend three Baptist preachers, who were arrested and tried on the solemn charge of "preaching the gospel of the Son of God," and that mighty man defended those men of God. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen—So far as the sufferings of the Baptists are concerned, I certainly concede that many of them have suffered, and we are disposed to admit all that as true; so far as we know, we are disposed to admit the truth connected with their history and their sufferings, but then the point is this—[At this point several persons rose to leave the room.]

Dr. Lucas—"Just mark my time till they are gone out. If there are any others of our Baptist friends who think they can not stand the firing, why we will cordially excuse them."

Elder Ray—"They went out when I commenced speaking just the same. I don't suppose that those are Baptists that are going out. I suppose it is because they are tired."

President Cook—"Those that have gone out, as far as I know, are not members of any church."

Dr. Lucas—"We will now proceed." I desire your attention to a point, if it bears upon the question at all, the argument that the martyr church constitutes the church of Christ; then there must be but one martyr church. But when we come to notice history, we find that numbers of churches have had their martyrs by hundreds and by thousands, and, consequently, it proves just as much for one church as for the other; and it proves, therefore, a number of churches is the church, or churches of Christ, and not this or that particular church. Hence, the argument fails.

But, my friend comes to succession again. He finds he

can get along a great deal better on succession when he can quote from this, that, and the other book, than to give us an exposition of Dr. Ray's power and ability in the defense of his proposition. He gets along better reading, than he does really in talking, and, hence, he goes back to books again. Well, if he wants to go on in that way, we will just merely respond in the language of his Baptist brethren, that none need the succession for which he contends, but those who found their church upon superstition and tradition, and not on the word of God. We will just let Brother Benedict and Brother Brown, author of the Encyclopedia, a Baptist historian, reply to the gentleman every time he tries to make this point. They said that no church but that church that would labor to found itself, or establish itself, upon tradition, and not on the word of God, needs this succession, and we leave it.

But he refers to Romans vi. 17, 18, where we quoted the passage, that though "ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness," and have your fruit unto holiness, and in the end everlasting life. He says, the Dr. certainly means Baptism there. Well, I certainly did not say a word about it, but I did say that when they obeyed from the heart, the form of doctrine delivered to them, that Paul says they were made free from sin; and I did say, also, that "whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed," and shall enjoy the liberty or the benefits flowing from obedience to this law of liberty. He shall enjoy the liberty and freedom there promised. I did say that "seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, *see that ye* love one another

with a pure heart fervently: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh *is* as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." I did say that, and said that Peter calls the truth the word, and the word the gospel; which is the word, which, by the gospel, is preached unto you; and when they obeyed the gospel, they are purified in soul according to the statement of the apostle. "Purify your souls in obeying the truth," and this obedience, therefore, is necessary, and this purification is necessary in order to the enjoyment of the freedom from sin. I did say that, and I quoted from the word of God what the apostles have said on that subject.

But, again: "The Association expelled the Disciples from the Baptists." I will still deny that assertion. I deny that the Baptist church expelled Alexander Campbell, and those associated with him from the Baptist church. And my friend will not stand here and say that the Association had any authority to expel anybody, either a member or a church. I will state that Mr. Campbell, and those connected with him, were not connected with the Dover Association at the time, and, so far as I know, never were connected with that Association. At any rate, at the time that this committee reported, upon which there was a diversity of opinion at the time they reported upon the question, as read by my worthy friend, they were not connected with that Association. That Association had no authority to expel them. First, it had none to expel anybody. An Association has not this authority in the Baptist church, either to expel a member or a church from the church; but, then, even grant that they had, these men referred to by my friend were not connected with that

Dover Association, and, consequently, if they had the power, they could not have expelled them, they not being connected with it.

He talks about "joining." "Now," said he, "the Dr. has said that our theory upon conversion is wrong, but if I were to go and join his church he would say to the brethren, 'sing a song, and we will extend the hand of fellowship, and the conversion would be all right.'" Now, I will just reply to him, and, so far as this question is concerned, will pay him off in his own coin exactly. He says that we deny the Holy Spirit in conversion. Well, so far as that is concerned, I deny his view of it—this supernatural operation; but I do not deny the influence and operation of the Spirit of God through the word of truth. We do not deny that; but we deny the supernatural and immediate operation and influence of the Spirit of God. We deny that theory of the Spirit's influence. He says we deny the operation of the Spirit. Well, you may find respectable members of the Christian church who reside in a community where we have no organization, and sometimes it occurs that these individuals have happened to settle in such places. Suppose there is a Baptist church in that locality, and they propose to join it; now, I ask, what is the action of that church with these persons? "Oh," my friend says, "we deny the operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion." Well, brethren, these individuals are respectable members of the church to which they belong. Shall we receive them in our fellowship, that is, the fellowship of the Baptist church? The brethren propose a vote, and they vote, "yes;" we will receive them. And they are voted in, as has been done in this place, and, also, in the congregation at Dover, a few miles in the country—just take them in in that way. Now, then, if the gentleman's point is worth anything at all, we have simply paid him off in his own kind of change. They do that way, too; take in those that he says deny the

operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion; they take them in as they are—*just as they are.*

But the gentleman comes to the question of depravity. We have offered an argument against the gentleman's church because it teaches that man is by inheritance totally depraved, corrupt in every faculty of the soul and member of his body, incapable of thinking a good thought, or doing a good deed; that he is opposed to all good, and prone to all evil; and their theory of conversion is founded upon this idea of man's corruption and depravity. Well, the gentleman tries to prove the doctrine—he tries to prove that man is just that corrupt; but where does he find the truth of his statement? He turns to the 51st psalm and the 5th verse: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Our first remark in regard to this passage is, that Dr. Adam Clarke, in his note on this text, says that the word *cholaleti*, which we translate "shapen," means, more properly, there, "brought forth." That is his statement, whose scholarship is recognized and admitted by all. And therefore the psalmist is speaking of the state into which the individual was introduced. This was the point, then, presented by the psalmist, and proves nothing for the gentleman. And, secondly, we remark that the language is highly figurative, such as the psalmist was in the habit of using. In another psalm he is speaking of himself, and when speaking says: "I am a worm, and no man" [Psalms xvii. 6]; showing the highly figurative manner in which the psalmist speaks, the figurative manner adopted by him in the presentation of this thought. But, again, you take Psalms lviii. 3, referred to by the gentleman: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." *As soon as they are born they go astray, speaking lies.* Now, I wonder if there is an individual in this audience that believes that the psalmist intends his language to be understood literally, that is, as soon as a child

is born it goes astray telling falsehoods? Does anybody understand that the psalmist is here speaking literally? Does not every one know that the language of the psalmist here is highly figurative? Who ever heard of an infant as soon as it was born speaking lies? The psalmist would convey simply this thought, that very early in life a child engages in expressions that are not true, but are false, and is never supposed to teach, I presume, that the very moment the child is born it begins to tell falsehoods. These passages are highly figurative, and, consequently, prove nothing for the gentleman. They prove nothing upon the point, and when you turn to the book of Genesis vi. you have it there stated: "God looked down and beheld the wickedness of men, that the wickedness of men had become great in the earth." On a little further, he says: "All flesh has corrupted its way;"—that this corruption is the result of the action of the individual, and not transmitted by virtue of inheritance, by virtue of the connection existing between the father and the child. "All flesh has corrupted its way," is the language of the word of God. But we find a number of passages on the subject of man's growing worse and worse. I ask, how it is possible for an individual that is totally depraved, depraved entirely, in every faculty of his soul and member of his body—I repeat, how is it possible for a man thus corrupt to grow worse and worse? I ask you, how can the thing be? And I venture the assertion that if you were going to describe the depravity and corruption of the devil himself, you could not do it in stronger terms than to say that he is totally corrupt in every faculty of the soul and member of the body. You could not make the language stronger if your life depended on it. Yet the doctrine and theory of the gentleman says, that the innocent babe upon its mother's arm is by nature as corrupt as the devil himself—that the innocent babe, that smiles so sweetly in its mother's face, is totally and entirely corrupt in every faculty

of its soul and member of its body. That is the doctrine of total depravity. This is the doctrine that the gentleman's church contends for and founds its theory upon, of immediate operation of the spirit and the supernatural working of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner in order to his conversion. I say that the gentleman's church is wrong from this consideration in connection with the others that we have submitted for your consideration. He refers to the case of Lydia, whose heart the Lord opened. Now, there is no controversy as to whether the Lord entered Lydia's heart or not. There is no controversy here, but the question is, how did he do it? The gentleman's theory says that he did it by the immediate, by the supernatural operation of the Spirit of God; that I deny. The gentleman has made no progress by referring to this case, until he shows that the Lord by the immediate operation, by the supernatural operation of the Spirit of God opened the heart of Lydia; but how? The gentleman affirms a certain way, I deny it, now let him prove it. He says, no man can come to the Father except the Father draw him. That is not the question. How does God draw the sinner to him? The question is not whether he does it. We admit he does it, and we say he can not come to God unless God draws him; but we deny that it is by immediate and supernatural influence. The gentleman's theory affirms it in this way; I deny it; let him prove it. It is very easy to make an assertion or statement, but the gentleman is on the proving side now, let him prove it. He says, why did not I deny certain statements made in the former discussion; why did I not deny them then, and not now? I was proving then, I was not on the denying side. I am on the denying side now, and he is on the proving side, and let him prove. While we are denying, we deny what we regard as untrue, and we think by the time we get through with the gentleman that we will prove a good deal against his theory and position. And now, while the matter

is in my mind, I wish to call your attention to a point presented in this Religious Encyclopedia in regard to the gentleman's church; it is on history—religion and history. He says: "It has been asserted that the Baptists originated in Germany about the year 1522, at the beginning of the Reformation. It is true that no denomination of Protestants can trace the origin of its present name further back than about the time of the Reformation." You can not trace the Baptist church further back than about the time of the Reformation, according to the statement of this Baptist authority. And yet the gentleman stands here and says that Jesus Christ established the Baptist church.

MR. RAY—Page?

MR. LUCAS—Page 188. This is the declaration of this Baptist authority. Now, we state a little more upon that question. We propose to trace its connection back through the Mennonites and through the Waldenses; and I will state that the Mennonites not only practiced baptism by immersion, but practiced baptism by pouring and sprinkling. Will the gentleman make this a link in his chain? And not only so, but the Waldenses, that he proposes to constitute another link in his chain, practiced both adult and infant baptism. Will he make them a link in the Baptist chain of succession? I ask you to stop and think in regard to the gentleman's chain of succession—one link practicing immersion, sprinkling, and pouring, another link practicing adult and infant baptism. This is the chain unbroken of succession that the gentleman would present for your consideration and for your reception. You can not go beyond 1522 and find the existence, according to his own authority, of a Baptist church. And yet he tells you it goes back to the days of Jesus Christ, and that Jesus established the church, and that the Baptist church was founded upon Jesus, and Jesus was its head. Were it not for adopting the language of the gentleman awhile ago,

I would say, I am ashamed of such quibbling and argumentation.

We now desire to state a third argument in connection with the theory of conversion. We argue that the gentleman is wrong in his proposition; thirdly, because the Baptists are wrong in their teaching with regard to repentance. My friend argues that repentance must, in the very nature of things, come before faith. The argument is founded upon the fact that repentance is mentioned before faith; therefore, he contends that this is the order in which they exist. Well, I will give you a case to think upon, and try it according to this rule. In the 3d chapter of John, and the 5th verse, Jesus says: "Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Nearly the entire religious world say that "born of water," is baptism. Now, then, I ask you, because the birth of the water, or baptism, is mentioned before the influence of the Spirit of God, does it necessarily follow that baptism comes first? that man is baptized before he is brought under the influence of the Holy Spirit? If the gentleman founds his argument upon the order in the one case—because the one is mentioned before the other—to be consistent, he must do it in this case. And, then, he makes too much entirely of water, or baptism, for my brethren; for we say, though you were to baptize a man ten thousand times, without the influence of the Spirit upon his heart, that it would be of no avail, that it would be of no value whatever. And yet the birth of water—of baptism—is mentioned first. We call your attention to one other passage, the 2d of Ephesians, and the closing part of that chapter. Here we have the apostle's language: "For ye are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." The apostles are mentioned before the prophets, and the gentleman says, the prophets here relate to the Old Testament

prophets—the prophets under the Jewish dispensation, and yet the apostles are mentioned first. "Built upon the foundation of *apostles and prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the corner stone." If he argues because the one is named before the other, therefore, that must be the order that he must affirm, that the apostles are older than the Jewish prophets, and that they existed first. To be consistent, he must take that as his position. If the argument is worth a farthing in one case, it is worth as much in the other. They have changed and perverted the true order of the commandments of God, and, therefore, they are not the Church of Christ—they do not possess the characteristics which entitle them to be the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. [TIME EXPIRED.]

Seventh Evening.

ELDER RAY'S SIXTH ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Brethren Moderators, and Ladies and Gentlemen—I am before you again, in the providence of God, in defense and support of the proposition which has been read several times, that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics which entitle them to be regarded as the visible church, or kingdom of Jesus Christ. Your attention is immediately called to the last reply. My friend said, that if the martyrs proved anything for our church that a multitude of churches had furnished martyrs. I again affirm *that the Baptists are the only church or people who were the martyrs for Christ through the dark ages before the Reformation of the* 16*th century.* The Romish church can not be recognized as the martyr church, because it was the persecuting power. It was that Antichrist that persecuted the church. She did not commit such folly as to execute and destroy her own members, but she did murder many of the saints, God's children, who were witnesses for the church in those times of fearful darkness.

My friend says, that he denies that the Disciples were excluded from the Baptist church, or that Mr. Campbell was excluded from the Baptist church. I did not say that Mr. Campbell was excluded from the Baptist church. I said *that I am identified with that denomination that had excluded Mr. Campbell and his Disciples from their fellowship.* Mr. Campbell came in

with a little society and went out with it. It is true he was in fellowship among the Baptists at one time, and got out of that fellowship contrary to his own wishes, and afterward he uttered a great many complaints for having been denied the fellowship; and as this was not denied in the discussion of the other proposition, the proof I introduced is sufficient for the present.

Again, he affirmed that when I showed that according to his own practice, and that of his church, he did not believe that our plan of conversion was essentially wrong, from the fact that they receive those who have been converted according to the Baptist plan without any qualification, except merely to unite with them. Instead of meeting the difficulty and answering it squarely, he said he would answer it by bringing a similar difficulty upon us; and he said that we were in the habit—notwithstanding that we contended that they denied the work of the Spirit of God in conversion—of taking those who are converted under their plan, without any qualification whatever. Now, this statement, I think, is not strictly correct; in fact, I deny it. Those who were taken from among them without baptism, *are those who have professed* CONVERSION AND REGENERATION INDEPENDENT OF THE ACTION OF BAPTISM. They professed to obtain that blessing before their baptism among the Disciples. When they are received irregularly, and, as we believe, inconsistently, it is only the exception, and that occasionally. But always these persons have professed to have received that change of heart that we call conversion, in which is involved the pardon of sins. So, then, he is mistaken, and the case is not parallel. While he says that we are wrong in regard to this, and wrong in regard to the other, *whether in fellowship with us, or standing* EXCLUDED, *one who goes to that society, to that church, is received just as he is, which shows* that the gentleman's church does not regard our plan of conversion as essentially wrong.

But the Dr. comes to the doctrine of depravity, and he makes a very sad picture of it, and says that the Bible represents man as growing worse and worse, while the Baptists say men are totally depraved, that they can't get any worse, that they are as bad as they can be. Then he harrowed up a fearful picture, and said it was the doctrine of the Baptist church that the sweet babe is as corrupt in every member of its soul and body as the *devil himself*. This, I will state, is an overdrawn picture; in fact, it is not correct, and I call upon him for the proof. When I made a charge against his church when investigating its claims, I introduced the proof to sustain it; but when he makes a charge in regard to our church or doctrine, I call upon him to prove that charge. *I state emphatically that you can not find in any of our standard works any such definition of depravity.* I wish to call your attention now to the definition of *total depravity*, as given by Andrew Fuller in his works, vol. 2, p. 662: "If by total depravity you mean that men are so corrupt as to be incapable of adding sin to sin, I know of no person who maintains any such sentiment. All I mean by the term is this: That the human heart is by nature totally destitute of love to God, or of love to man, as the creature of God, and, consequently, is destitute of all true virtue. A being may be utterly destitute of good, and therefore depraved (such it will be allowed, is Satan), and yet be capable of adding iniquity to iniquity without end." But while Satan is totally depraved, he is accountable to God.

Depravity, as we understand it, and as defined here by Mr. Fuller, is not the overt manifestation of sin, but that condition of sin, being destitute of spiritual life, destitute of righteousness, destitute of holiness. When we declare of a human being that he is thus depraved, we do not understand that he is a mass of corruption practically. This certainly is a very sad mistake into which the gentleman has fallen concerning Baptist views, and with many, perhaps, of his brethren. Here is

what Dr. Jeter says on the subject, p. 130: "The spirit of inspiration has drawn the picture of man's moral corruption in gloomy colors. He is utterly depraved—fleshly, sensual and impure. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh.'—John, iii. 6. He is without spiritual life, without holiness, without moral worth—'dead in trespasses and sins.'—Eph. ii. 1." Thus we hold, that this depravity we speak of is not a mass of practical corruption and depravity—the body as well as the soul.

In regard to the proof-texts I quoted from Psalms li. 5, the gentleman quoted from Adam Clarke, but he did not quote quite enough to give Mr. Clarke's views on depravity: "Notwithstanding all that Grotius and others have said to the contrary, I believe David to speak here of what is commonly called *original sin;* the propensity to evil which every man brings into the world with him; and which is the fruitful source whence all transgression proceeds." And then, again, says Adam Clarke on this subject, "As my parts were developed in the womb, the sinful principle diffused itself through the whole, so that body and mind grew up in a state of corruption and moral imperfection." And this is what that learned commentator says in regard to that passage, conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity, found in the passage already referred to. Ps. lviii. 3, I believe, where it states that as soon as they be born, they go forth from the womb, speaking lies. Grant that it be figurative language; yet it indicates that spiritual obliquity, that moral deformity and depravity which an unregenerate person brings with him into the world. I wish to read upon the subject of depravity from Alexander Campbell, in his Creed, that he wrote in days past, as found in vol. 2 of Richardson's Memoirs of Campbell, p. 616: "I believe that every human heing participates in all the consequences of the fall of Adam, and is born into the world frail and depraved in all his moral powers and capacities. So that without faith in Christ it is impossible

for him in that state to please God." It turns out that Mr. Campbell himself (and I suppose my friend will not deny the testimony of Mr. Campbell upon this subject) contended that depravity was hereditary, and that a man was frail and depraved by nature, by birth, in all of his moral powers; that he came into the world in that condition. This is just as strong as the Baptists usually define total depravity. And yet the gentleman has drawn that dreadful picture, and so overdrawn it as to harrow up a feeling of bitterness against the Baptists—as if they thought the unconscious infant was as bad as the devil. No Baptist ever taught such folly or nonsense, and I hope he will not assert it again, unless he has the proof. I refer to the Religious Encyclopedia, p. 452: "Human depravity essentially consists in a state of mind the opposite of that which is required by the divine law. The sum of divine law being love, the essence of depravity consists in the want of love to God, and our neighbor; or, in other words, the preference of some other object or objects, to the exclusion of those required in the divine law." This is enough in regard to the definition of depravity as given by the Baptists, and also as given by the great light of the gentleman's own church.

But I want to make this statement: that it is agreed that Jesus Christ came to the world to seek and to save that which was lost; and if man, by nature, is righteous, is not involved in the fall, and if his moral powers are, by nature, pure, then one who is already pure does not need a Saviour, and can not be saved through Christ, but is dependent on his own righteousness. I will ask the gentleman if he believes that all men that go to heaven must *be saved* by Christ? If he admits this, he must admit that they need a *Saviour*, that without him they could never be happy in heaven.

In regard to that passage, the opening of Lydia's heart, he says he agrees to this, but the controversy is about the how.

Well, I wish you to notice particularly, that the Lord *opened her heart* that she might attend to the things spoken by Paul, showing that the work God did was one thing, and the preaching of the gospel was another; the words of the apostle one thing, and God's work another. According to the gentleman's doctrine, it was Paul, who, by his argument, opened her heart! *It was the Lord who opened her heart that she attended to the things spoken by Paul.*

The gentleman tells us that the Mennonites, that we claim as our predecessors, were addicted to pouring for baptism. I simply deny the charge; and I call upon him, before I proceed to answer the charge, to introduce the proof. I know that the modern Mennonites here in America practiced pouring; but we claim no succession from them whatever. And if the Dr. wishes to understand the subject, as soon as he is initiated into the history of the Mennonites sufficiently, he will find that the original Mennonites—the Anabaptists—were as pure Baptists in their doctrine and practices as any the world ever saw; consequently, he must introduce the proof to sustain his charge. I say the charge is not well founded. It is not through these Mennonites here in the United States that we trace our history.

Well then, again, the Dr. has told us that the Waldenses, through whom we claim succession, were in the habit of baptizing infants, and as this is just in the line in which I was starting, I will call attention to some proofs on that subject at once. I am going to read from Jones' Church History; first, on page 11, 5th edition, he says: "But here we stop; it is needless to pursue the subject further. Enough has surely been said to show that the present race of the Protestant churches, in Piedmont, bears little or no affinity to the ancient Waldenses, either in their doctrinal sentiments, their discipline, external order, or their religious practices; and it is an act of justice to the memory of those excellent

people to rescue them from this unnatural alliance." On page 12, he says: "They brought up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; but they neither sprinkled or immersed them, under the notion of administering Christian baptism; they were, in a word, so many distinct churches of Antipedobaptists." Here, then, is that charge refuted. But I go back to the testimony of these ancient suffering Waldenses; I quote from a document as copied into Jones', page 249, and found in Perrin and in nearly all the histories of the Waldenses, called the "Waldensian Confession." And the Waldenses made these confessions in order to refute the false charges made by enemies in regard to the doctrines they were said to have held. Article 12, of the Waldensian Confession, says: "We consider the sacraments as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper and even necessary that believers use these symbols, or visible forms, when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity to observe them." Art. 13: "We acknowledge no sacraments (as of divine appointment) but Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Again, page 251, of the same work—another ancient Waldensian document—7th Article: "We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is a visible and external sign, which represents to us that which, by virtue of God's invisible operation, is within us, namely: the renovation of our minds, and the mortification of our members through Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life." It appears that the Waldenses professed *faith* and *a change of life* before baptism. Little infants can't do this. Not in one of these ancient Waldensian Confessions can the gentleman find an article about

infant baptism. This fact forbids the idea of infant baptism. Then, here is a document that was prepared by the ancient Waldenses, said to have been long before the time of Waldo himself. It is an article or treatise upon Antichrist, giving a description of Rome or Antichrist. They say, Jones, page 252: "He teaches to baptize children unto the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration, thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows order, and, indeed, grounds all his Christianity." This is enough just here, and I state *that there is no document known in the world—dated document—prior to* 1508, *that charges the Waldenses with infant baptism.* The learned historian, Wm. Wall, one of the ablest writers on the Pedobaptist side, has ransacked all the documents of the past, and with all his learning, he found no traces of infant baptism among the ancient Waldenses; and, I affirm here, and when I do so, I affirm that to be a fact, which I know as well as any historic fact, *that there is no evidence known on earth of infant baptism among the ancient Waldenses.* The charge is without foundation, and it goes to the ground. But the Dr. tells us that the Baptists were wrong, because they do not have repentance just exactly as he would have it; and, as I expect to go on that line presently, I will call your attention to some facts that I wish to present further in regard to the succession of the Baptists. He has not denied that the American Baptists descended from the English and Welsh Baptists, who came across the Atlantic ocean—the "Atlantic Cable," I will call it, of our succession, is unbroken—going back from the shores of America to the old world.

But in regard to the English Baptists, I admit that there were some differences among them. There were some called particular Baptists, on the ground of their views of the atonement; and there were some that were called General Baptists.

They did not differ materially in their church organization—at least, one wing of the General Baptists, so called. But the main body of the Baptists of America descended from those that were in that country, called, at least a part of the time, Particular Baptists; and I wish now to call your attention to a fact or two in regard to this: At the time when a large number of Pedobaptist Dissenters embraced Baptist views, as they were not very well posted in regard to Baptist affairs in that country, they sent one of their number across the British channel, to a Baptist church at Amsterdam, that had the regular succession from the ancient Waldenses, to receive baptism from the hands of their pastor. I now quote from Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. I, p. 102: "But hearing that some in the Netherlands practiced it, [immersion] they agreed to send over one, Mr. Richard Blunt, who understood the Dutch language. That he went accordingly, carrying letters of recommendation with him, and was kindly received, both by the church there and Mr. *John Batte*, their teacher. That upon his return he baptized Mr. *Samuel Blacklock*, a minister, and these two baptized the rest of their company, whose names are in the manuscript to the number of fifty-three." There is the proof that these ancient Particular Baptists, as they were called, those most influential in England, received there a baptism by succession from that ancient Waldensian Baptist church. The charge was once made, that one, John Smith, who was denominated a *Se-Baptist*, was the head and founder of one wing of the Baptist church. Upon that point Mr. Crosby says, vol. I, p. 99: "If he (John Smith) were guilty of what they charge him with, 'tis no blemish on the English *Baptists*, who neither approved of any such method, nor did they receive their *baptism* from him." Here is the testimony from Crosby's History of the English Baptists; and I could produce other testimony, showing that the English Baptists had

their succession from the ancient Waldensian Baptists, who, in latter times, as the historians have said, were called Mennonites, in some parts of the land.

Now, in regard to these ancient people, I call your attention to Mr. Orchard, p. 16, quoted from D'Aubigne's History concerning the Baptists and the Munster Anabaptists: "One point it seems necessary to guard against misapprehension. Some persons imagine that the Anabaptists of the times of the Reformation and the Baptists of our day are the same. But they are as different as possible." This proves that the ancient Munsterites were not our ancestors, and that we had no connection with them.

I wish to introduce one more testimony in regard to the succession of these ancient Waldensian Baptists, from Dr. Allix, a Pedobaptist historian, and one of the most learned men that ever wrote the history of the ancient Waldenses. P. 364 of his History of the Churches of Piedmont: "Wherefore that they ought not to expect till some who had their ordination from Rome should, by their love to truth, be brought over to them, who might ordain pastors for them, but rather ordain themselves, as occasion should offer. And forasmuch as the said *Waldenses declared that they had lawful bishops among them, and a lawful and uninterrupted succession from the apostles themselves*, they very solemnly created three of their ministers bishops, conferring upon them the power of ordaining ministers, though they did not think fit to take upon them the name of bishops, because of the antichristian abuse of that name, contenting themselves with the name of *elders*." Mark the fact, that the ancient Waldenses claimed an uninterrupted succession from the time of the apostles, and in ordaining some ministers that came over to them from the Calixtines, they claimed the right to ordain them, and claimed *to have the succession, coming down from the time of Christ himself.* Mr. Robinson says, in regard to this, in his Ecclesiastical Researches,

p. 127: "They tax Novatian with being parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the empire; and yet he had no other influence over any than what his good example gave him. People saw everywhere the same cause of complaint, and groaned for relief; and when one man made a stand for virtue, the crisis had arrived—people saw the propriety of the cure, and applied the same means to their own relief." Thus we have the testimony of Robinson in regard to the character of the ancient Novatians, as they were called, who were afterward, when they fled from Italy, called by the name of Waldenses.

Again, we have the testimony of Mr. Orchard, in regard to these ancient Novatians, p. 55: "On account of the church's severity of discipline, the example was followed by many, and churches of this order flourished in the greatest part of those provinces who had received the gospel."

And then, again, we have the testimony of Neander, in his Church History of the three first centuries, p. 143: "As his principles are so clearly to be explained from the sternness of his Christian character, as he was acting, in this instance, in the spirit of a whole party of the church existing at the time, there is less need to resort to an explanation, deduced from an external cause, which is supported by no historical proof." Here is the proof, that the people called *Novatians* did not originate with *Novatian*. They declared non-fellowship with those churches that were leading off into the *apostasy*. Crispin, the French historian, says concerning the Novatians and Donatists, as reported by Mr. D'Anvers on Baptism, p. 223, in regard to this people: "*First.* For purity of church members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into churches but such as were visibly true believers or real saints. [That is Baptist doctrine—real saints, before they were entered or allowed to enter the church membership.] *Secondly.* For the purity of church discipline, as the application of church cen-

sures, and keeping out such as had apostatized, or scandalously sinned. *Thirdly.* They both agreed in asserting the power, rights, and privileges of particular churches, against anti-christian encroachments of presbyters, bishops and synods. *Fourthly.* That they baptized again those whose first baptism they had ground to doubt."

We could heap testimony upon testimony upon this subject. Geo. Waddington takes the same ground, that these ancient Waldenses were the descendants of the ancient church which kept the pure doctrines of the first century, and Cramp, in his history of the Baptists, takes the same ground.

Now, I think, with the proofs that I have already adduced, that the succession, the perpetuity of the church of the living God is clearly made out, and it belongs to the people now called Baptists.

I wish to call your attention, as we advance, to another argument in regard to the Baptist claims to be the church of the living God. It has already been discussed, and my friend does not disprove it, that we have no other foundation than Jesus Christ. He did, it is true, make, as I think, a very poor effort at argument to show that some fundamental principles among Baptists were called a foundation, but he should understand that we claim no foundation except Christ himself, when it comes to the great foundation. But your attention is called to the Scriptures upon the subject: "That rock was Christ,"—as we find in 1st Cor. x. 4—that followed ancient Israel, and so upon the same rock Jesus said, "I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Again, we find, in 1st Cor. iii. 11: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Again, 1st Peter ii. 6: "Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." Again, as to the primary principles of the church, I find in the symbolical city represented in Revela-

tions xxi. 14: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen—I shall at once proceed to notice some points that I have marked down on the address to which you have listened, and to call your attention to some authorities bearing upon the point under discussion. My friend first states that the Baptist church is the only martyr church. This question I deny, and feel very certain that the gentleman is aware of the fact, that the Episcopal church, that the Lutheran, and the Presbyterian, and the Quaker, all suffered in this direction, to say nothing of the Catholics. These churches all suffered and had their martyrs numbered by hundreds and thousands. We say, again, if from the fact that the gentleman's church had martyrs, proves it to be the church of Christ, then it proves just as much for every other church which has in its history some members who sealed the sincerity of their faith with their blood. It proves as much for the one as it does for the other. It is a principle in logic, that which proves too much proves nothing. The gentleman's argument proves too much, for it proves as much in favor of all these other churches; and, consequently, it proves none of them to be the church of Christ.

Again, my friend speaks of the Baptists, who declared non-fellowship with Mr. Campbell. We stated that they did not expel Mr. Campbell from their church; but he says they declared non-fellowship with him. Some of them did declare non-fellowship with him, but they were Calvinist Baptists, the strongest class in this country—and my friend

says he belongs to that class of Baptists that disavowed fellowship with Mr. Campbell; and, therefore, the gentleman is a Calvinist, as were they; and, consequently, we know where to place him as a Baptist. He is a Calvinist Baptist, believing in the doctrine of separate unconditional election. We may gather some light in regard to the view that the gentleman entertains in reference to election, the elect and non-elect, in as much as we have now found where the gentleman stands. He is a Calvinist Baptist, believing in separate unconditional election. But he says those who join the Baptist church from the Christian church, state thus and so with regard to the subject of conversion. Well, now, I do not know what is true with regard to all of them, but I will simply state that some joined at this place and some joined out at Dover, who made no such retraction, as the gentleman has stated; and he is mistaken on that subject. They did state: "If you will take me as I am, without any change of views, I will unite with you." Some of them stated this, so I have been informed, and they took them. At least one, and I might name others, joined the Baptist church here. When the question was propounded to one of our brethren: "Is that individual in good standing in her own church?" The answer of that brother was, that she was "an orderly and pious member;" and the question, at once upon the statement of this brother, was put to vote, and the church received the individual by vote without any difficulty at all. These things occur very frequently; at least this is the information that I have upon the subject.

With regard to the subject of total depravity again. The subject of total depravity hurts my friend very much. He feels its force. Now, then, I want to state what Mr. Williams says, who quotes too from Brother Jeter, in a work on the subject of total depravity. In the first place he says—and one thing I wish to have specially noted, namely, on p. 86:

"If we prove the doctrine of total depravity, we prove the agency of the Holy Spirit in conversion." And, again, in referring to the same matter, he goes on to state what he means by "the agency of the Holy Spirit in conversion." "We believe in the agency of the Spirit in conversion through the word of truth." But then he goes on to state what he means by it; and calls it "the supernatural operation of the Spirit of God." The supernatural influence of the Spirit. That is what he means when he speaks of the influence of the Spirit as being necessary if man is the subject of hereditary total depravity. Now, then (p. 224), he says: "It is first assumed that man is totally," or, as Mr. Jeter has it, "thoroughly or totally depraved." This depravity is defined to involve the faculties of the soul and members of the body; that man, by virtue of inheritance, is the subject of total depravity. This is what they say when treating on the subject of total depravity. Well, I ask this question: Please tell this audience how much more depraved the devil is than totally depraved in every faculty of his soul and member of his body.

Mr. Ray—What are you reading that from?

Mr. Lucas—I will read you plenty on it directly.

He states that by inheritance, according to the doctrine of hereditary total depravity, that the infant babe upon its mother's arm is just that corrupt, totally depraved by inheritance, in every faculty of the soul and member of the body, which is the doctrine of hereditary total depravity. While I have this matter up I will give you some authority on the subject of hereditary total depravity, first stating that the Philadelphia confession of faith, adopted by the Baptists, is, with very slight modifications, the very same confession of faith called the Westminster confession of faith, gotten up by the Presbyterians. The Philadelphia confession of faith is the same, with but very slight modification, and with none, as I now recollect, upon the subject of depravity. Now, we call your

attention to what is stated in the confession already referred to with regard to the agency of sin, that you may have it clearly before your minds. In chapter 6, paragraph 4, we have these words: "From this original corruption, whereby we are thoroughly indisposed, disabled, and made opposed to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." In paragraph 2 we are told that "by the first sin our first parents became wholly defiled in all the faculities and parts of the soul and body." In paragraph 3 we are told that the guilt of this sin was imparted, and the same death in sin and corrupt nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending to them from generation to generation." Here you discover the picture that is furnished of hereditary total depravity, and, consequently, we say again, if there can be a stronger picture drawn of the depravity of the devil, I would like to witness that effort. I would like to hear the gentleman describe the depravity of the devil, and make it worse than that. And yet this doctrine affirms of every individual—even of the innocent babe that smiles so sweetly in its mother's face—affirms of it this total corruption in the faculties of the soul and members of the body.

We now come to the question of the Mennonites again, and the Waldenses. We stated that the Mennonites practiced sprinkling, or pouring, in baptism, as well as immersion, and that the Waldenses recognized infant baptism, although they practiced immersion. Now, we give you authority upon that subject, and we cite you to the testimony of this Baptist author, in his Religious Encyclopedia. Under the head of "Waldenses," we have this statement: "That they understood and practiced immersion as baptism, is evident; and whether they generally practiced infant baptism has been long a matter of dispute. The Baptists"—those occupying my friend's position—"have always controverted this, in order to get a general succession, and others who occupy their ground have

done the same thing. The words of Reinerius seem to imply in his time (1250) that there were different opinions on this point among the Waldenses; some were for infant baptism, and some were not, but the modern Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont do practice it." The Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont do practice infant baptism, according to this authority.

We turn and see what he says under the head of Mennonites. We call your attention to the following: "Baptism," Mr. Gan says, "consists in immersion, or in pouring the water in the name," etc. "Conversion and faith are necessary, and those who are children of Christian parents, and have been educated in the Christian church, are under obligations to be baptized, as well as converted Jews and heathen. They train up catechumens under their ministers, and about the age of sixteen baptize them, taking from the candidate before the ministers and elders, an account of his repentance and faith. They reject infant baptism, and refuse to commune at the Lord's table with any who administer the ordinance to children, unless resprinkled." Now, this is what this Baptist authority says with regard to the Mennonites sprinkling. We have quoted what they say with regard to the Waldenses in the valley of the Piedmont, who practice infant baptism, and these very Mennonites claim to receive their authority from Menno, the founder and progenitor of the Mennonites. They claim to receive their sprinkling from Menno, their founder and their leader; and it is quite presumable that these Mennonites understood the matter as well as my worthy friend. But with reference to the fact that Smith was the founder of the Regular Baptists which he referred to—for he certainly did intend to refer to John Smith as the founder. He positively stated on his own authority, that Smith was the founder of the Regular Baptists, and now he goes through the line of Particular Baptists, and the Particular Baptists

constitute the chain in his line, and not the Regulars. We will give you authority upon this subject of Particular Baptists. My friend has introduced Mosheim several times; though I have had the work here all the time, I have not quoted from it, but I will quote from it a little upon this subject. On page 500, something is said in regard to the Particular Baptists and the General Baptists: "The General Baptists, or, as they are called, the Antipedobaptists, are dispersed in great numbers through several counties of England, and are, for the most part, persons of mean condition, almost totally destitute of learning and knowledge. This latter circumstance will appear less surprising, when it is considered that, like the ancient Mennonites, they professed a contempt of erudition and science. There is much latitude in their system of religious doctrine, which consists in such vague and general principles, as rendered their communion accessible to Christians of almost all denominations; and, accordingly they tolerated, in fact, and received among them persons of every sect, even Socinians and Arians; nor do they reject from their communion any who profess themselves Christians, and receive the Scriptures as the source of truth and rule of faith. They agree with the Particular Baptists,"—now mark, they agree with "the Particular Baptists in this circumstance, that they admit baptism of adult persons only, and administer that sacrament by dipping or total immersion; but they differ from them in another respect, that is, in their repeating the administration of baptism to those who had received it, either in a state of infancy, or by aspersion, instead of dipping; for if the common accounts may be believed, the Particular Baptists do not carry matters so far." Here, then, according to this authority, the Particular Baptists, through which the gentleman proposes to trace his connection, according to the authority that he has introduced himself, they do not re-baptize infants or those

who had been baptized in infancy; and then, though they had been baptized by aspersion, according to the statement of this witness introduced by my friend himself, they do not rebaptize that individual. There were these points of difference between General and Particular Baptists, according to Mosheim. He quotes Robinson, and Orchard, and Jones, in order to sustain his point; and every one of them have tried just as hard to prove what he is trying to prove, as he ever did in all his life; and, as a matter of course, if you will introduce these men with their prejudices, who can see every thing very clearly, that looks in that direction, while those things that stand opposed are not so easily seen. Were I to assert the doctrine of succession, and call upon friend Ray to testify in favor of it, I have no doubt but he would get up and say, "certainly, that is the doctrine" beyond all dispute; and so Orchard and Jones say, and all those men who stand with my friend in regard to this matter. This is *ex parte* testimony. Here is a work—Macaulay in reply to Gladstone—where Macaulay is controverting this very same subject, and shows clearly that this is not a doctrine that can be established. The church of England claims the very same thing that my friend does for the Baptists. The Greek church claims succession, and each one is trying to prove his line of succession. They are trying to prove it, and they all have failed to do it, and will fail to the end. My friend and every one else has failed to do it. We venture the assertion that the Catholic church, or the Greek church, either can make out a much clearer line of succession than can my friend, or any church of God. But then, after it is all made out, then what? As we have quoted time and again, from Benedict and from the Religious Encyclopedia, which works have been before you. They state that this unbroken line of succession is necessary only in cases where the organizations claiming it are established upon tradition

and not upon the word of God. But, there is one other point: the gentleman has advanced to another argument. He says that the Baptist church is founded upon Jesus Christ, and says I have not denied it. The gentleman's memory is very treacherous upon this point, for I have positively denied it, and stated that his church can not be founded upon Jesus Christ as the foundation, from admissions and statements that he himself has made. He claims that for the Baptist church, and yet he can not read of it in the Bible, and he can not read of the Baptist church anywhere until the 15th century, if all heaven were offered him; before that time he can not read of it in history. He says that his church was established during the personal ministry of the Saviour in the days of John the Baptist. We stated that Jesus was presented, as found in Isaiah xxviii. 16, as the foundation and tried corner-stone, the tried stone, the precious corner-stone, and we have stated—and he will not deny it—that he was tried by the persecutions of Satan; that he was tried in his poverty; that he was tried when he suffered the shameful treatment before Pilate's bar, in the crown of thorns and the mock robe, and the Roman scourge; that he suffered, finally, when he was tried upon Calvary, and poured out his warm heart's blood upon Calvary's rugged brow, when he bowed his head and died upon the tree of the cross; that these sufferings finished his trials here, and he entered not into the foundation until he became a tried stone; and then, after this, when the tried stone that the builders rejected became the head of the corner. But we call your attention to another passage, as found in Ephes. ii., where it is said: "After Jesus had taken the middle wall of partition out of the way, and had nailed it to the cross, that after this one new man," one new church, was made and founded upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. This was after his death. His church, he says,

was established before Christ's death, and if this was after his death, and his church was built before, it was not founded upon Jesus, the Christ, as the true and only foundation. We deny his position upon this subject, and lay before your minds the points with which we closed our argument last evening. We stated that the gentleman's church was not the church of Christ, because it had not the gospel arrangement of the commandments of God as they exist in fact. We noticed his argument, founded upon the statement that one is mentioned before the other. We gave you a number of cases where this same order occurs, according to the statement, and he will not affirm that the statement there presents the order as they exist in fact, and, yet, if his argument is worth a farthing in the one case, it is worth just as much in the other; that because the one is stated before the other, that therefore this must be the order in fact. The ground of this argument we deny.

We call your attention to a passage found in Heb. xi. 6: "He that cometh to God must believe that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek him, and that without faith it is impossible to please him." We state that whatever is before faith, is without it, until faith is added. Here the apostle affirms that without faith it is impossible to please God. His repentance, therefore, if it comes before faith is of no avail or importance, until the faith is added, for without faith it is impossible to please God. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S SEVENTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, BRETHREN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED CONGREGATION: Your attention is called immediately to the gentleman's speech. The Dr. refers to Mr. Williams, I believe, on *total* depravity and the necessity of the supernatural operation of the Spirit; that men are *utterly* and *totally* depraved. If men are depraved at all, particularly in the sense in which we have already defined the word, I say, they are "utterly" so, or "entirely" so; that is, they are destitute of spiritual life, destitute of love to God, destitute of holiness, and this is the extent of depravity contended for by Baptists. The Dr.'s reading from the Westminster Calvinistic Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and then trying to crowd it down this audience at the present time as Baptist doctrine, is certainly absurd in the superlative. I deny that this is the doctrine of the Baptists at this time, or that it has been at any other time, and if he affirms it is, let him read the proof from a Baptist document: "That all the faculties of the soul and members of the body are totally and entirely depraved!" My friend has not read a word of proof from a Baptist author, where it is said, that all the faculties of the *soul* and *body* are entirely depraved; and the gentleman must not bring a charge upon the denomination without proof. *I call for the proof; you must give it, or else it will go to the report* THAT YOU MADE A CHARGE YOU CAN NOT PROVE.

The "sweet babe." O, how he can play upon the sympathy of the people. The sweet babe *totally depraved in all the members of soul and body!* No Baptist ever said so that

ever I have read anywhere. But, by nature, we are said in the Bible to be without God; we are said to be children of wrath; that the carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law. We must not refuse to believe this, if we believe God's word—if we believe what God has said in regard to the moral condition of man. Mr. Campbell, his own author, teaches just about the same in regard to this depravity, as we have quoted from Baptist authors.

We wish you to notice what the Dr. said about the *Waldenses* and the *Mennonites*. He said, on last night, that the Waldenses, through whom we claim succession, practiced *infant baptism*. He modifies it a little now. At first he said the Waldenses did it; but now he has changed the statement a little bit. In relation to the Waldenses, everybody, who knows anything of the history of the present Pedobaptist Waldenses, knows that they never had any connection with the *ancient Waldenses*. When you read our histories, you will find that we claim to have descended from the ancient Waldenses, those that had no historic connection whatever with the present inhabitants of the valleys of the Alps. These are facts that the gentleman ought to know. He ought to know that Mosheim, the historian, has slandered the Baptists a good deal, but has admitted some very important points in their favor. He was a Lutheran and a hater of the Baptists and ancient Waldenses.

I will read in regard to the Waldenses, as given here in the Encyclopedia, p. 1147: "It seems to be a serious mistake into which some popular writers have fallen, who represent the Waldenses as originating in France, about the year 1170, and deriving their name from the celebrated Peter Waldo. The evidence is now ample, that, so far from being a new sect at that period, they had existed under various names as a distinct class of dissenters from the established churches of Greece and Rome in the earliest ages. It is an

egregious error to suppose that when Christianity was taken into alliance with the state, by the emperor Constantine, in the beginning of the fourth century, all the orthodox churches were so ignorant of the genius of their religion as to consent to the corruption of a worldly establishment." On the same page this learned author says: "These Puritans, being exposed to severe and sanguinary persecutions for dissent, from age to age, were compelled to shelter themselves from the desolating storm in retirement; and when at intervals they reappear on the page of contemporary history, and their principles are propagated with new boldness and success, they are styled a new sect and receive a new name, though in reality they are the same people." This shows the succession of the Waldenses. The gentleman has produced no proof that the ancient Waldenses practiced infant baptism—none whatever. But he thinks he has got proof from Mosheim, that the Particular Baptists of England admitted infant baptism, or admitted those who had not been immersed! I will call your attention to the testimony of Mosheim upon the subject, and, as I before stated, I do not quote Mosheim as showing that we approve all he said; for I state, that he was one of the most bitter haters of the Baptists that ever wrote, and many of these concessions are extorted from him by stern and stubborn facts. They are only to be taken as concessions, while he misunderstands and misrepresents the Baptists very often. Here is what he said about these Particular Baptists, beginning on page 500:

"Others are called Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, for the striking resemblance of their religious system to that of the Presbyterians, who have Calvin for their chief. The Baptists of the later sect settled chiefly in London and in the adjacent towns and villages; and they have departed so far from the tenets of their ancestors, that, at this day, they retain no more of the peculiar doctrines and institutions of

the Mennonites, than the administration of baptism by immersion, and the refusal of the sacrament to infants, and those of tender years; and, consequently, they have none of those scruples relating to oaths, wars, and the functions of magistracy, which still remain among even the most rational part of the Mennonites." The ancient Waldensian Baptists were opposed to bearing arms; were opposed to serving in official positions in the state. And these Particular Baptists in England agreed with them in the administration of baptism by immersion, *and the rejection of infant baptism.*

So, according to Mosheim, the Particular Baptists were the same with the ancient Mennonites. He only states what the gentleman has read, as a kind of rumor or report. He does not quote a single statement of fact; and he can not. The rumor from Mosheim is too palpable for any man to believe—that the Particular Baptists of England ever practiced *infant baptism*, or received members upon anything except immersion!

I call your attention again to the testimony in regard to the Mennonites, of whom the Dr. speaks. Mosheim, in his history, page 500 (I have the quotation here convenient, and I will read it from the "BAPTIST SUCCESSION," page 432), says: "The Baptists of the latter sect settled chiefly in London." This is the same quotation I have read. I will read on page 433: "And yet it is certain that the present Mennonites, as they have, in many other respects, departed from the principles and maxims of their ancestors, have, also, given a striking instance of defection in the case now before us, and have almost wholly relinquished this fundamental doctrine of their sect, relating to the nature of the Christian church." (Mosheim, p. 497.)

Speaking of two parties among the Mennonites, Mosheim says, page 496: One party favored a rigid execution of church discipline, while the other was more moderate. He

says: "These two sects are, to this very day, distinguished by that denomination of *fine* and *gross;* or, to express the distinctions in more intelligible terms, into rigid and moderate Anabaptists. The former observe with the most religious accuracy, veneration and precision, the ancient doctrine, discipline, and precepts of the purer sort of Anabaptists; the latter depart much more from the primitive sentiments, manners, and institutions of their sect, and more nearly approached those of the Protestant churches. The gross or modern Anabaptists consisted, at first, of the inhabitants of a district in North Holland, called Waterland; and, hence, this whole sect received the denomination of Water Landrians."

So these gross Mennonites departed from the principles and practices of the Mennonites, or those called Anabaptists, with regard to whose origin Mosheim himself says it is buried in the remote depths of antiquity, and extremely difficult to be ascertained. The gentleman affirmed that Mr. Smith (he did not tell us which one it was, I would like for him to give us a little light upon that subject)—that Mr. Smith was the founder of the *Regular Baptists.* I wish the proof. I want the Dr., when he makes a charge, not simply to make it and pass it by, but I want him to prove the charge. I let it pass until he attempts the proof.

I will proceed now in my line of argument. The Baptists possess the *Bible foundation.* The simple denial of the gentleman has nothing to do with the question. I have stated, from God's word, *that the foundation is Jesus Christ.* The Dr. does not deny that the primary members, according to that symbolic city, whose foundation stones represented the apostles, as being those first introduced into the organization.

We come, now, to the foundation as regards doctrine, and quote the very same that he has quoted, Eph. ii. 19, 20: "The foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-*stone.*" We claim the teach-

ing of the apostles and the prophets, as being the doctrinal foundation—the doctrine of the apostles and prophets. But my friend's church can not go to the prophets to sustain their plan of salvation. We contend that the very plan of salvation that we advocate was preached, was advocated, was taught, by the ancient prophets, as well as apostles. Then, in Acts x. 43: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." There the apostles appealed to the prophets—the Old Testament prophets—who taught that, through his name, every believer in him was to receive, and would receive, remission of sins.

Now, we come to another point—one the gentleman has already touched upon—*the order of the commandments.* He says we are wrong because we have not the proper order, because we teach that repentance in point of order comes prior to faith with the heart—prior to the faith of love, and says that our repentance is not of faith! Because the apostle has said that it is impossible to please God without faith; "for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." My friend has built up, as he supposed, quite an argument, as follows: "Whatsoever is before faith, is without faith, until faith is added; if repentance is before faith, it is without faith, until faith is added; and therefore repentance will not please God! Now, this seems to be a singular argument. And on the same principle I would say that hearing the word which he admits must be before faith (because one can not believe without hearing)—if hearing the word is before faith, then it is without faith, until faith is added; consequently, it is displeasing to God, because without faith it is impossible to please Him! Going to the house of prayer may be before faith, and it is without faith till faith is added; consequently, going to church is displeasing to God! Oh! what a quibble.

The gentleman made a rule, in one of the former discussions, "*that whatever is essential to the production of faith is legitimate, and must be understood.*" I said, *amen.* Whatever is essential to the production of faith is legitimate—that it must be understood. There is no faith *with the heart,* before the individual is *penitent.* Sinners, in the letter to the Romans, are said to be *haters of God.* We do not love God while in a state of nature. The man that does not love God can not love him till he repents; therefore he can not have faith *with the heart* prior to repentance. We do not contend that a man is to repent before he knows there is a God; but there is a vast difference, as already noticed, between knowing there is a God, or believing that God *is,* and believing *in* the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But the gentleman says we are wrong, because we preach this order. Well, if we are, dear friend, we are in splendid company. I will read now the passages of Scripture on which we depend for holding this order of the ordinances. The Saviour, while preaching said, Mark i. 15: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." Here *he* puts repentance and faith down together: "*Repent ye, and believe the gospel.*" My friend would say: "believe the gospel and repent!" because the Saviour did not give the proper order!! Again we find in Matthew xxi. 32, where the Saviour said: "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." Jesus makes *repentance in order to faith.* Again, in Acts. xx 21, Paul says, in regard to his labors at Ephesus: "Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." It will be seen, that every time that these commands are mentioned in God's word, *repentance* is first, every time when they are mentioned in connection. This

order is fixed, and irreversible. But the gentleman claims, that we violate God's word—the eternal truth of God!—and he claims, that the Saviour was mistaken, that Paul did not understand himself. Now, because the Baptists follow the Saviour in their order of preaching, because they follow Paul, who suffered so much for Christ, the gentleman says, we *are not the church of Christ!* Then Paul was not in the church of Christ! The apostolic churches were not the churches of Christ, because this is the order the Saviour established. And to save him from purgatory the gentleman can not find *his order* in God's precious book; he must therefore get up a system of philosophy of his own. I will say, dear friends, according to the structure of the human mind, according to common sense, if you please, according to philosophy, no man can believe *in* Christ until he is repentant. Suppose I am guilty of hating my friend. I believe that he exists; I believe all about him; but speaking of him I say, "I do not believe in that man," "I do not trust and confide in him." And the gentleman must know, if he will look in his Greek Lexicon, that the meaning of the word *pistis* (faith), embraces *trust.* You can not, to save your life, find faith, in God's word, in the sense of justification, without *trust—confidence*;—this is the loving faith. No man can have the *loving faith* while he hates a brother or hates God. Now, as I was carrying out my illustration, suppose I am *hating* that individual, I can not *trust* him and love him until the change takes place which brings me from *hatred* to *love*; and that change is repentance. It is an internal change, a change of mind and soul; and yet the gentleman talks about having faith before that change! The carnal heart is said to be *enmity* against God—not subject to his law—and yet the gentleman advocates such a system as changes the order of the commands, and, therefore, it is not the system that is squared

and measured by the word of the living God. It is contrary to the testimony of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I wish to advance with my argument, if I have time, by saying that we are the Church of the living God; *because we introduce into the organization those who are properly prepared—the proper materials.* This has been discussed already, and will take but little time. It has been proved from God's word. While, upon his proposition, the Dr. did not deny, I believe, the position that I took in regard to the materials being properly prepared. It is true, we differed somewhat in regard to the preparation, but that they must be scripturally prepared is agreed. Now, what is that preparation? They must be children of God; otherwise, you take them in as children of Satan, as we have proved that his church did this. The Disciples propose to take them in, to make them children of God! But I read a statement again of Mr. Anderson, indorsed by himself, in one of the former discussions. He says:

"*The Baptists baptize men because they are Christians, while the Disciples baptize men to make them Christians. If the Baptists are right in this, then the Disciples are wrong.*" So I say. Now, I wish to call your attention to the testimony I find on page 181, Religious Encyclopedia, of the Baptists views of the materials, as follows: "That in the opinion of Baptists, baptism is the *immersion in water of a suitable candidate, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* The only suitable candidate is a person *who has been born of the Spirit, and who is united to Christ by faith.*" We contend that none should be baptized except those *who are born of the Spirit of the living God, and united to Christ by faith.* Again, we find, Religious Encyclopedia, page 191, the following: "OF BAPTISM AND OF THE LORD'S SUPPER—Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Father,

Son, and Spirit; to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, with its purifying power; that it is prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation; and to the Lord's Supper, in which the members of the church, by the use of the bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ; preceded always by solemn self-examination." There we have the testimony, and the gentleman will not deny it, that this is fundamental Baptist doctrine, and, if I have time, I will quote to you the testimony of Dr. Lynd, his favorite Baptist authority, in regard to the design of baptism, from page 11, same work: "This is the justification of a sinner, or his reception for the first time into the favor of God; in which, in reference to the law and its penalty, he is viewed as if he WERE righteous. There is also the justification of the believer, which does not embrace the idea of restoration to the favor of God. It is simply a justification of the believer by his obedience to the teachings of Jesus Christ. The former, that is, the justification of the ungodly, is the point so frequently argued by the apostle Paul in his letters to the Romans and the Gallatians. The latter, that is, the justification of the righteous, is the theme of the apostle James. Both illustrate by the example of Abraham, but at different periods of his history. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness—at least forty years before he was justified by works—when he proceeded at the command of God to offer up his son Isaac.

The justification of the sinner, is, by faith alone, without any work of law. The proof of this is unnecessary to present, as the fact is admitted by all evangelical Christians. This justification is entirely gratuitous. It must of necessity be so, because all are sinners. Hence, Paul says: 'Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption, that is in Christ Jesus." Now, his justification must be by faith, in order to be

of grace. If it were not so, it could not be sure to all the spiritual and of Abraham. Here we have a well established basis. With this all our views of divine truth must harmonize. The love of God as the *moving* cause of our justification; the atonement of Christ is the *procuring* cause; and faith is the *instrumental* cause. Baptism is never mentioned in Scripture as a cause of any kind of justification." And yet the gentleman seems to have misunderstood Dr. Lynd; he supposed that Dr. Lynd had been contending for baptism as a condition, really, of pardon.

Again, on page 16: "The fact can not be called in question, that salvation is predicated of faith, of baptism, and regeneration, and persevering obedience. But it is not predicated of each in the same sense." Whatever Dr. Lynd said, in regard to baptism, in connection with salvation, it can not be in the sense of justification. He did not so believe. It is a characteristic of the Baptists to stand upon this great fundamental principle, *that Jesus Christ is the great foundation, and that one must be justified in the sight of God by faith.* When Dr. Lynd says *faith alone*, he does not mean without repentance, because repentance is essential to faith with the heart; and that justification, then, by works, is the manifestation of that faith, that faith of subjection to Christ, which Dr. Lynd talks about, manifested in the sight of the world. The truth of God's word sustains fully, as we believe, our position in regard to justification by grace through faith, that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God. We have the testimony of the apostle upon this subject, Rom. vi. 1–7: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by

the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' SEVENTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Just while this question of Dr. Lynd is before the mind, and as my friend has got back to the discussion of Baptism again, we will call your attention to a passage or two. We have in the discussion with the gentleman stated that Dr. Lynd said that the sinner was justified by faith alone, but he goes on to define what he means by this faith by which the sinner is justified; I will read—and I might read a number of other passages, that state the same fact—on page 26 he is speaking of baptism, which he calls subjection to Jesus Christ, and he goes on to state, "for a man may submit to this ordinance, and not be really in the kingdom of Christ, and because of such refusal we clearly say that they have not the faith to justify: This subjection to Jesus Christ in baptism is necessary to the very existence of faith itself." Now, that is his language, "the subjection to Jesus Christ is necessary to the very existence of faith itself," "for it is an element of faith as much as love to God is an element of saving faith"—just as much. I mention another passage in connection with this subject. In discussing the subject of the remission of sins and repentance which the gentleman has introduced, I, in reply, call your attention to Dr. Lynd upon this subject: "The expression for the remission of sins would ordinarily indicate the same as the words in order to the remission of sins. Professor Hackett, of Newton, who may be regarded as good authority, has translated the passage—Acts ii. 38, *eis aphesin amartiōn*—by the words "in order to;" that

is what Dr. Lynd says. And, he says, "in this he will probably be sustained by the most distinguished scholars." Now we call your attention to Dr. Hackett himself, one who translated the Scriptures under the supervision of the Bible Revision Association. Mr. H. says, in confirmation of the statement made by Dr. Lynd: "Upon the subject of Acts ii. 38, for the remission of sins in order to remission or forgiveness of sins *eis aphesin amartiōn*, that these words were connected naturally with both of the preceding verbs, this expression *eis aphesin amartiōn*, in order to the forgiveness of sins. This expression is connected naturally with both of the preceding verbs, that is, the clause states the motive and object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces no exhortation in one part of it to the exclusion of another." That is what he says on this subject. We call your attention to some points in the gentleman's last address. He speaks of confession. We stated that the confession of the Baptist church simply reiterated the Westminster confession. We made that statement simply, because we did not have the Baptist confession with us to-night; but we pledge you that we will have it here on to-morrow evening, and we will show you that what we have stated is just the truth; and, hence, as we had not the copy, we read from the Westminster Confession of Faith, but we will show the other when we shall meet on to-morrow.

But as to the foundation of the Baptist church again. The gentleman says that I did not deny that they built upon the right foundation. I do most positively deny it. I have not made any statement more emphatic in this discussion than that, and I show, according to his statement, that his church was built at the wrong time, and that Jesus was the tried stone and foundation referred to in Ephesians, showing that the church was built after the middle wall of partition was taken away, and founded on the apostles and prophets, Jesus

himself being the chief corner-stone. My friend's church, according to his own statement of the time when it was built, could not have been built upon that foundation, for that foundation was not prepared or established. I hope the gentleman will not tell this audience again that I have not denied it. I have done so, and given my reasons for it. Let him remove the objection that we found upon these passages, and then he will do something. But he fails to do anything for his cause until he shall remove those difficulties. His getting up and saying, I have not denied this, that, and the other, is doing nothing for his cause. Let him remove the difficulties, and then he has done something. But he quotes Acts x. 43: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Now, I suppose that he quoted this passage to show that the individual receives remission of sins by faith alone. I can not tell what else he quoted it for. What does Peter affirm here? He affirms that the prophets bear testimony that through the name of Jesus Christ, he who believes in him shall receive remission of sins. There is just one question in regard to this passage. My friend's theory makes it faith alone, and this I deny. According to Acts of the Apostles x. 11, Peter was to tell him, whereupon he should be saved. The gentleman has given you only a part of what Peter preached. He showed that the prophets looked to him as the Messiah that was to come, and when they were induced to receive the proclamation made by Peter in regard to Jesus Christ, when they, as on former occasions, believed on him, he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and unless baptism has two designs, baptism was, at the house of Cornelius, just what it was for on the day of Pentecost, and Dr. Lynd and Hackett, as we read to you, both affirm that it was in order to the remission of sins, and consequently this was the part of the words that Peter was to tell him, whereby he and

his house were to be saved. Hence the gentleman has gained nothing by referring to the Acts or Cornelius.

They are wrong in the order of the commandments. Now, the gentleman did not present the issue as we presented it. We presented the issue thus: The gentleman is wrong, for he teaches that because repentance is mentioned before faith, that therefore that is the order in fact; while we deny that this is the order in fact, and cite you to John iii. and Eph. ii., where apostles are mentioned before prophets, which he will not affirm to be the case. This is the ground of his argument. I hold, that if his argument is worth anything in the one case, it is worth as much in the other, or he must show that his argument here is better in the passages to which he refers than it is in the others, or otherwise he gains nothing by it. He referred to the fact, that hearing comes before faith. We answer just as he stated, that which is necessary in order to the production of faith, is legitimate. Then he says, that repentance occupies that relation to faith, that it comes before faith and is in order to the production of faith. We submit this proposition, that the repentance, which is unto salvation could not exist without the antecedent, godly sorrow. Godly sorrow must antedate that repentance, which is unto salvation, because Paul affirms [2d Corinthians, vii. 10.] that godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation, that needeth not to be repented of. We submit that repentance unto salvation can not exist without godly sorrow. Yet godly sorrow does exist before it works repentance unto salvation. We submit another proposition, that no man can have a godly sorrow for sin that has not faith with the heart, for that godly sorrow, which works repentance unto salvation, is a condition of the heart, and therefore it must be antedated by faith in the heart in order that the sorrow exist. And this sorrow must exist before the repentance that it works. Consequently faith is first

from its nature, and also from the nature and character of repentance. Now, I call your attention to Dr. Lynd again. My friend has arrived at a point that he is disposed to acknowledge Dr. Lynd as a good Baptist. At first he did not consult or indorse him, I do not know that he will do it yet, but he seemed to indicate that he will do so. On page 9, of Dr. Lynd's work, he says: "If a man truly believes he will repent of his sins." Dr. Lynd, therefore, makes faith come before repentance. If a man truly believes, has his heart purified by faith, he will repent, and his repentance will be right. Now, I call your attention to Dr. Jeter, page 246: "The wisdom and grace of God are eminently manifested in making faith, and not immersion, the line of discrimination between the states of condemnation and justification." We want you to bear in mind, now, that Dr. Jeter is a Baptist, and has written a Baptist book against what he calls Campbellism. "It is a line invisible to us, but not to God. It marks the precise point at which the rebel becomes a child. It is the commencement of spiritual life, and is the source of all true obedience." Now, then, we want to call your attention to this language especially. It is the commencement of all spiritual life, and is the source of all true obedience. We give you the following syllogisms for your consideration, and for that of my friend. The first that we present is this:

Spiritual life is commenced in faith.—Dr. Jeter.

Repentance is essential to spiritual life.—My friend. Therefore,

Repentance is commenced in faith.—Lucas.

That is the conclusion we draw from these premises, and we challenge the gentleman to show its fallacy. We repeat this syllogism: Spiritual life is commenced in faith; repentance is essential to spiritual life; therefore, repentance is commenced in faith. If commenced in faith, faith must come

before repentance; it can not come before that in which repentance is commenced. But, again, we give you another. The statement here is, that it is the source of all true obedience. All true obedience embraces repentance. Man can not truly obey God, as God has commanded, unless he does repent of his sins. All true obedience embraces repentance; faith is the source of all true obedience; therefore, faith is the source of repentance. The gentleman, on one occasion, asked for some "therefores." We give him some to which we invite his special attention, and we wish him to show that these syllogisms are illogical, and that they are not reliable. We say that from the premises, as here furnished, that we can come to no other conclusion than that faith is the commencement of spiritual life, and there is no spiritual life without repentance; and, therefore, we say that faith must come before repentance, as it comes before spiritual life; and as faith is the source of all true obedience, if repentance is a part of true obedience, it must be a source of repentance, and, therefore, it must exist before it. We say these facts are so clear, that every one must see them at once.

With regard to the proper material again. Well, we have stated before, and we state now, that we claim as much in the preparation as the gentleman. We claim faith with all the heart—repentance in the gospel sense of the word. If we claim the faith and the repentance, then, in the language of Paul, this penitent believer is baptized into Christ, and he thus puts on Christ, being baptized into the faith. Why? Surely because we believe Paul upon this question, and we carry out the divine plan; our position certainly can not be objectionable on this account, when we have all that he has, and all that the apostles present upon the subject.

We call your attention now to the argument further upon the gentleman's position. We state, sixthly, that his theory of the knowledge of pardon is wrong—wrong in regard to

the means by which that knowledge is obtained. According to Mr. Williams, it is enjoyed as the result of feeling, and is not from the positive declaration made in the divine volume. It is the result of feeling and not baptism, according to Mr. Williams, or any act or faith. We state, that if feeling is the evidence of pardon, then every individual can prove himself right. You take that worshiper according to the system of the papacy, you see that individual as she approaches the confessional, and her countenance is sad, she is bowed down in grief and sorrow, and every indication is that of sorrow and sadness and deep anguish of heart, but after she has gone to the confessional, her eye sparkles with joy, her countenance is bright, her step is quick and joyous; I ask you, wherefore is the change? "Why," she says, "my sins are pardoned." "How do you know they are pardoned?" "The priest has pardoned my sins, and I feel that all my sins are remitted." We state, that, if feeling is an evidence of pardon, it is in the case of that Catholic lady, she has as much proof of the fact as my friend, and therefore the conclusion forces itself upon the mind, that his theory of the evidence of pardon is wrong, or otherwise both of these are right, and the priest has actual power to pardon sins, and this lady's sins are actually pardoned. And we might go on from this system, that system, and the other system throughout Christendom; we might refer to all of them to show that they all have evidence of the fact, if this be evidence, that they are right and their sins are pardoned.

But the seventh argument is this: the practice of the Baptists in the observance of the Lord's Supper is inconsistent and unscriptural, I mean those that my friend represents. There are some Baptists that stand precisely where we do upon the question, that do teach precisely what we teach upon this subject, but I mean those that are represented by my friend—that their theory and practice are inconsistent and

unscriptural. Now, here is the individual that my friend admits to be a child of God, just as good as he is. He acknowledges that he is just as pious, just as devoted, and that Christ has pardoned his sins, and that he is a member of the kingdom of Christ. I presume he will admit, in some sense or other at least, he is a member of the kingdom; he is a child of God, and therefore a member of the family of God. Well, the apostles say to those approaching this table: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat. He that eateth unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to his own soul." My friend here, and the church that he represents, assume the right to examine the individual, and, in contradiction of the statement of the apostle, tell him, "Sir, we have examined you, and you shall not eat." Paul says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." My friend says, "No, we will examine you, and say you shall not eat, unless you have come up to our particular standard." And yet the gentleman acknowledges the individual to be a child of God—a member of the family of God—but he assumes the right to examine this child of God. But when he would approach his father's table, and partake of the emblems of the body and blood of the Son of God, my friend says: "No, sir, you shall not do it, you shall not eat."

Now, then, we have given you as many as ten distinct organizations of Baptists, ten members of the Baptist family; and we now state this proposition—and the gentleman will not deny it. The Particular Baptists will not admit the Regulars, neither will the Regulars admit the Particulars; and so with the Old Connection, with the New Connection, and with the Particulars, and the Seventh-Day Baptists—not that they have not come in just precisely as my friend came in, not that they have not entered according to the law as presented by himself, but he would examine that individual and say: "Sir, though Paul says to you, 'let a man examine

himself, and so let him eat,' we take the position that we will examine you, and tell you, sir, no, you shall not eat." Therefore, we say that the gentleman is inconsistent, and his position is unscriptural upon this subject. We desire that you shall look at this question closely and seriously, and we bring the matter a little nearer home. Not only those who belong to the different branches of the Baptist family, but independent organizations or associations of their own—there are many in his church—that even take the position that those who are not members of this particular local organization, have not the right to commune with those in that organization, though they are of the same faith, the same order; yet, not being members of this particular organization, they should not partake of the emblems of the body and blood of Jesus. They carry their doctrine in regard to the communion and the restrictions to be placed over it to this extent. But we call your attention now to some facts in regard to the position, assumed by the gentleman with reference to his kingdom—and to other points in connection therewith, and we present a few objections to his theory as we stated. [TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S EIGHTH ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My worthy friend seems to be very much troubled about the Baptist communion; and, yet, he has said in this discussion, that the Baptist church is Babylon! a part of Babylon. He says that the Baptists are in Babylon; and he is so much inclined to Babylon, that he wants to commune with Babylon! That is the ridiculous attitude in which he finds himself now, pleading for sympathy and "open communion." The Pedobaptists he does not believe to have been born of God. Then, they are children of Satan. Now, he wants to commune with them—for popularity, it seems to me. The gentleman's church holds to that "open" system, as he calls it, of communion! He quoted a passage or two of Scripture in regard to the Lord's Supper, where it is said: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." If he will notice in the first chapter, first and second verses, 1st Cor., that it is addressed to "the church of God, which is at Corinth"—not addressed to everybody. This "*church of God at Corinth*," as we find in 1st Cor. xi. 21, had acted very indecently in eating: "Every one taketh before *other* his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken." Thus they acted disorderly, and the apostle wrote a letter to the church at Corinth. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of *that* bread, and drink of *that* cup." Suppose, in my absence, I hear of the congregation where I labor, that they have done likewise. I write a letter to them, addressing that congregation at Athens, Kentucky, and say: "Let a man

examine himself, and so let him eat," &c.; do you suppose that I have given instruction to persons not in that organization, when I addressed that organization? But he says that Ray proposes—or his church—"to examine." Well, we call attention to 1st Cor. v. 11-13: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Here, then, the apostle says with such an one *we are not to eat.* Then we must *judge* to some extent. I am not comparing idolaters and extortioners to the Pedobaptists, but I am quoting this to show that we are commanded *to judge those that are within;* that is, we are to judge who have entered into fellowship and into membership with the church. This is the authority God has given. If not, there can be no church discipline. You might exclude a man to-day for the worst conduct imaginable, but according to the principles of "open communion," practiced lately, he can go among the Disciples and commune with them without any exclusion from their fellowship. God's children will be held responsible for internal heresy or false doctrine, and for the moral standing of church members.

Then, in regard to this question of communion. We appeal to no sympathy except that which is gained from the truth of God's word. I ask, did the Son of God institute the supper before baptism? No, he did not. That man who would approach the Lord's table before baptism, violates the example of the Son of God. And the man that teaches him to do so teaches him to violate the law of God. Dr., how do you teach Pedobaptists about communion? Do you teach them that they have no right to commune with you? What do you

instruct them as to their religious duties? Do you teach that the unbaptized have the right to commune with you? "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." Do you teach that? I would like for you to notice this point while pleading for sympathy about communion. I find the Saviour, alone from the world, in that "upper room," invited none there except those representatives, or the primary members of that organization—that church of Christ—that kingdom that the Son of God had established. Jesus said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." But, says one, we believe in "open communion;" we will eat and drink when and where we please. The Lord's table *is in his kingdom.* Now, I will say that we, as Baptists, do not keep people from coming to the Lord's table. We invite every child of God to come to the Lord's table and there partake of the Lord's Supper; but if we were to invite men contrary to God's law, it would be rebellion against the Lord himself. We would be guilty of raising an adverse standard. We have no right to deviate from God's word to please men, whether good or bad. What would be thought of an angel who should preach another gospel? An apostle would say, "let him be accursed." We must follow the command of Christ, whether it is popular or not. When they cried out, "Men and brethren what shall we do," I suppose the gentleman's church would say, "Come along, and let us have open communion, that is the first thing necessary!" But that is not the fact. It is, "Repent and be baptized." Open communion violates God's eternal word. In John's letter to the Elect Lady, he says: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him 'God speed,' for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." One that holds fellowship with another doctrine hurtful in its nature, and invites

those into the church who are evil-doers, is a partaker of their evil deeds, errors and false doctrines, whatever they be. If I had time I should like to quote several authorities on the subject. Mr. Hibbard, one of the ablest and most consistent writers among the Pedobaptists, says (on Bap., page 174) of the Baptists, that "it is evident, according to our views of Baptism, we can admit them to our communion; but with their views of baptism, it is equally evident, they can never reciprocate the courtesy. And the charge of *close communion* is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us, inasmuch as the question of church-fellowship with them is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant church—so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned." Dr. Wall, the great Pedobaptist historian, says: "Among all the absurdities that ever were held none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized." And, again, we have the testimony of Mr. Campbell on the subject of communion; in the Millennial Harbinger, vol. 2, page 393, he says: "We do not recollect that we have ever argued out the merits of this 'free and open communion system.' But one remark we must offer in passing, that we must regard it as one of the weakest and most vulnerable causes ever plead; and the 'great' Mr. Hall, as he is called, has, in his defense of the practice, made it appear worse than before. In attempting to make it reasonable, he has only proved how unreasonable and unscriptural it is." I have quotation after quotation on the subject. Here is Mr. Campbell, the leader in the *Reformation*, who tells you that this open communion is *unreasonable* and *unscriptural*. But because the Baptists will not follow an UNREASONABLE *and* UNSCRIPTURAL practice, they are not the church of Christ! A strange fanaticism, it seems, has seized upon some who want us to violate God's word, in order to get sympathy—in order to be called *liberal* and *popular* in the world. But, I say, let us hold firmly to the *truth* of God's word.

I quote again from Dr. Lynd. I think the gentleman has misunderstood Dr. Lynd in regard to making baptism a part of faith—an essential part of it; I will try and quote a little more from the same work, DESIGN OF BAPTISM, page 26: "Jesus Christ does not regard us as saved from our former allegiance, or as being members of that spiritual kingdom which he has set up in the world, if we refuse to be baptized into the name of the Sacred Trinity, or to put on Christ in this ordinance; not simply because we are not baptized—for a man may submit to this ordinance, and not be really in the kingdom of Christ—but because, by such refusal, we clearly show that we have not the faith that justifies." Now, here is the part that the gentleman read—that is, "the subjection to Jesus Christ"—and he called it "in baptism." He put in a kind of parenthesis in the reading! Dr. Lynd says: "This subjection to Jesus Christ is necessary to the very existence of faith itself, for it is an element of faith as much as love to God is an element of saving faith." What is an element of faith? The subjection of the spirit—the subjection to Christ, that prompts him to obey when he learns the truth and his duty. But Dr. Lucas understands it another way. He would have it, that baptism is that subjection! In other words, Dr. Lynd teaches that it is saving faith that gives the spirit of subjection and enables one to come forward for the ordinance of baptism.

But my friend bases an argument upon the order of repentance and faith, and, forsooth, we are not the church of Christ because we preach like Jesus! and because we preach like the apostles!! that is the substance of his argument. Jesus said, *repent and believe;* the gentleman says, "believe and repent!" The Dr. says that I just simply base the argument for repentance before faith, because one is found before the other. I say, I based it thus, because one is essential to the existence of the other. Because faith *with the heart* can not exist in the soul

before repentance. He must have repentance before he can have that faith *with the heart.*

But my friend got up some arguments, and he thought he had several very important arguments. We will look over them: "Godly sorrow," he says, comes "before repentance." Well, grant that it is wrought by godly sorrow; does that prove that repentance comes after faith in point of order? By no means. Because we have shown before that this sorrow, in connection with repentance, must be exercised before we can have *faith with the heart.* This involves that change we were talking about, and his quotation from Dr. Jeter does not help him in the least. Dr. Jeter says, on the very page where he quoted, that repentance is inseparably connected with this faith he talks about. It is not repentance afterward. But that repentance with contrition is essential to the existence of that faith. Again, he says spiritual life commences with faith, according to Dr. Jeter, and repentance is essential to spiritual life. I will grant that repentance is essential to life, but it is also essential to faith with the heart. So, all his arguments have no sort of bearing upon the subject. Repentance is essential to spiritual life, certainly: so it is essential to faith with the heart. When we have faith with the heart, we have spiritual life. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." Well, the Dr. has one born of God before repentance, for he has repentance afterward; because, whenever he believes with his heart, he is *born of God.* If he believes with his heart before repentance, as the gentleman contends, he is born of God before, and independent of repentance! This is where his doctrine takes him.

But he said—I don't know whether he intended to or not—that repentance was the source of true obedience, and I drew this syllogism: Repentance is the source of true obedience; repentance is essential to faith; therefore, obedience is commenced in repentance. I reckon that will be just about as good a syllogism as he can fix up.

But the Baptist theory of the knowledge of pardon, or salvation, is wrong. This is the first time the Dr. has thought of that in our discussions. He has gotten up at least one new argument here, no more; that *feeling* must not be an evidence of pardon, oh, no—that it proves the Romanists to be right; that it proves they are right because that poor deluded one that goes and makes confession, goes away *feeling* that she is pardoned! Well, dear friends, I want to know, who goes any further in the Romish doctrine of church salvation, than the church to which the gentleman belongs. In the gentleman's church, salvation occurs in the act of baptism, properly administered. As practiced in the hands of the Romish church, a man goes, in order to salvation, to some one, to make his confession, who is authorized to tell him his sins are pardoned. In the gentleman's church the preacher tells him if he is baptized his sins are pardoned, if he has prerequisites which he requires; but he does not require the Bible prerequisite, for he is wrong in point of order of repentance and faith. He does not teach according to the Bible in regard to repentance and faith.

But in reference to faith I wish to notice one thing: Love is evidence of passing from death to life—1st John iii. 14: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." We learn that love is produced in the heart by the Holy Spirit—Rom. v. 5: "Hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." This is the way that love gets into the heart. Now, we know we *pass from death to life*, because we love. I wish to know if the Dr. thinks that there is no *feeling* in love—that *feeling* is not an evidence of love. He has of course such fine sensibilities, it would be sacrilege to say that he does not love his wife. But he does not know it by feelings! He has no internal feeling or emotions! He knows it, perhaps, be-

cause somebody told him so; because there is no internal evidence of love! But we know that we pass *from death unto life*, because we love. If there is any feeling in love, then there is feeling in the evidence of pardon. Now, we make the statement, that the Dr., if he had understood himself, would never have made such a flimsy argument. I ask him this question, and I wish him to answer it: *Can any body be immersed and fail being pardoned?* I wish you to answer now, *Yes* or *No*. If he was to answer, he would say, certainly, *yes*. What is necessary to his pardon, according to my friend? He must *obey from the heart*. Who knows whether he obeys from the heart—Dr. Lucas, or somebody else? He himself. He says he knows it himself. He is the only one that can. How? from internal, not external evidence. If he knows it, then there is *feeling*. He conscientiously knows he has obeyed from the heart; therefore, according to my friend's own doctrine, feeling is evidence of pardon. I say, according to the teachings of his own church, feeling is an evidence of pardon, internal and conscious. But I think he denies the true evidence of pardon, because he has inverted the order, and has different kinds of faith.

Now, I wish your attention to 1st John iv. 7: "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." Here is love before baptism, because to baptize a man hating God is utterly ridiculous and out of the question. But this one *is born of God and knows God*. He knows God because he loves God; and yet the Dr. tells you there is no internal evidence of pardon! Again, 1st John v. 10, "He that believeth in the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Here is the internal witness, then, that the Dr. repudiates! that we are to have the internal evidence. In Rev. ii. 17: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it." In this figure God rep-

resents his gift by a white stone, that no man knows except he that receives it. So, then, the Dr. has certainly lost that point against the Baptists.

But my friend contends that we are wrong in regard to the evidence of pardon. Now, I did not say that the internal is all the evidence of pardon. I wish you to notice the order of the witnesses, as found in 1st John v. 8: "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." Here is the witness of the spirit bearing testimony that we are God's children, with the love of God shed abroad in our hearts. Also, we have the order of the witnesses. We have the witness of the spirit, declaring the remission of sins; and, then, we have the witness of emblematic blood in the Lord's Supper, after baptism is church fellowship. In regard to the order, they are *spirit, water, and blood.* This is the order that God lays down.

We claim to be the church of Christ, because we observe the Bible church government. *We claim the Bible, and the Bible alone.* We not only claim it, but we claim the whole Testament. Dr. Wayland says, "The whole New Testament, and nothing but the Testament," and you will find this in all the statements of our faith and practice. But we call your attention to this, the gentleman will not deny it. I believe in a former discussion he admitted that we had this characteristic, that our government was right, and when we say New Testament we do not mean that our New Testament commences with the second chapter of Acts.

We take the model prayer, that Jesus gave, the whole of it; and we can say, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come." But Disciples do not generally pray that way; that prayer is out of date with them; they do not profess to take the whole of that prayer. We take the New Testament, and we try to preach and advocate the plan of salvation executed by Jesus Christ while upon

earth, when he said to the poor woman that washed his feet with penitential tears and wiped them with the tresses of her head, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." There was no baptism connected with that saving there. The baptism administered by John was *for the remission of sins*, in the very sense in which remission of sins is attached to baptism in the Acts of the Apostles. Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (John iv. 1). He made disciples, and then baptized them—baptized them because they were disciples.

We say: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." "If he shall neglect to hear them," finally "tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." We find that the entire church is authorized to act in the transaction of the business belonging to that body. We claim the government laid down in God's word. Our ministers, instead of being rulers in the sense of administering the discipline of the church, officially, are only the servants of the church. We occupy the place that the Bible assigns the ministers of Christ.

But I wish to introduce a few more passages in regard to salvation, and that before baptism. I have been questioned upon that important question that baptism is a condition of pardon and of salvation. Just before I sat down I had read from Rom. vi. 7, which says: "He that is dead is freed from sin." That *death to sin* was used in the sense of being separated from sin. That death to sin must take place before we are buried with Christ in baptism. If we bury a man before he is dead to sin, we bury him to kill him to sin, while he is joined to his sins. Now, the figure requires that one be separated from his sins—that he be dead to sin. When one dies physically, a separation takes place between the body and the spirit; and when we die to sin, the old body of sins is put away—the separation takes place. This must be before the

burial in baptism, or you destroy the figure. Then you are buried with Christ in baptism.

Again, the Dr. referred to Dr. Hackett, and others in regard to the baptismal question. Dr. Hackett connects both the verbs, Acts ii. 38, with the remission of sins. If you will go and examine him upon Acts xxii. : "Arise, brother Saul, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He does not make this washing away of sins a literal remission of sins, but only a formal washing away of sins, which is the doctrine of the Baptists.

But my friend intimates that I do not indorse Dr. Lynd. There are some expressions in Dr. Lynd I do not indorse, but I believe that he is as sound a Baptist as ever lived. He contends that the justification of the sinner is by faith alone; but I do not like to say "alone," because some will say you mean without repentance; but when it is explained, it is faith preceded by repentance. It is by grace, through faith, not ourselves, but it is the gift of God.

But to one more proof text: John v. 24: "He that believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Wilson's translation says, *is passed out of death into life*, that passage is immediate. When one believes in Christ he is already passed out of death unto life.

Again, we refer to Acts x. 43, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." They received the gift of tongues before their baptism. Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that those should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" I wish the Dr. would answer this question: Were they children of God? [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' EIGHTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My friend says I want to commune very badly with his church. I would like to know how he knows it. I have not said so; but I do say that they being wrong upon this question, is an argument against their claim that they are the church of Christ. That is what I say. The gentleman has a way of shifting positions and getting the points at issue in a different light from that in which they are presented. I argue that the Baptists are not the church of Christ, because they are inconsistent and unscriptural on this point. He says that the Pedobaptists are working for popularity. Well, he is very ungenerous to them; but we will just let that pass. What did he do with those cases of Baptists that came in just like he did? There are different organizations of the Baptist family, who do not commune or fraternize in this particular, and he does not invite them, and they do not invite him to commune. Did he notice those cases! Not at all! He knows what we say upon that subject is true, and he knows also that these are persons that have done, as far as submission to the gospel of Jesus Christ is concerned, that they have done all that he did; and, yet, while Paul says, "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat," my friend says, "No, we will examine you, and so let you not eat." That is his practice; and it is not his practice only so far as these other organizations of the Baptist family are concerned, but even they carry it frequently into the same faith and order, as they style it—for some of them contend that

members of one local congregation have no right to commune with members of another congregation of the same faith and order.

How does he propose to prove that they have the right to exclude from communion? He refers to the wicked person engaged in persecution against God, and in his case the apostle says, "put him away," judging him. Therefore he must judge the individual acknowledged to be a child of God, and when God says, "let him eat," he will say, "let him not eat." Now, I ask, where can any man find authority in the case of this wicked person for judging one that we acknowledge to be as good and pure as we are, and a child of God, and as consistent in his life as we are—how can he bring up a case of this kind and compare it with that wicked person that you are called upon to judge and put away from you, and say that we will take this case as authority to show that we have the right to judge a child of God, who is just as good as ourselves, and do the very opposite to what the word of God teaches. It says, "examine yourselves, and so eat," and he says, "no, we will examine you and tell you, 'no you shall not eat;'" hence, we say, his theory and practice in regard to the Lord's Supper is inconsistent, unscriptural and wrong. We furnish an argument here against one of the doctrines of this church, that it does not possess the characteristics that entitle it to be regarded as the visible church or kingdom of Jesus Christ. He has again brought up repentance before faith, and says that repentance—of course, gospel repentance—unto life is essential to the production of faith; we positively deny that the repentance unto life mentioned in the Scriptures is necessary to the production and the existence of faith. We deny that proposition. Now let him prove it, and then he will gain something. We said faith was the source of spiritual life. We knew exactly the point we were making. We had quoted from Jeter, and our syllogism we founded on the declaration that Jeter

says, "faith is the source of spiritual life," that "faith is the source of all true obedience," and we submitted the following syllogism on that statement that my friend has not denied: Spiritual life is commenced in faith; repentance is essential to Spiritual life; therefore, repentance is commenced in faith. The question of true obedience embraces repentance; all true obedience embraces repentance; faith is the source of all true obedience; therefore, faith is the source of repentance. How did the gentleman examine this syllogism? Well, I was certainly amused. He tried to examine one and finally said that I had said something of repentance. So I had—but he knew precisely the point I presented. He knew I had read this syllogism and presented the point to him, which he knew very well, for we have gone over this ground too often together for him to mistake this point. Hence, he says, "I don't know that he meant to say that." That is just what he did know, that I did not mean to say it, if I did say it; he knew it very well. But he noticed this syllogism, and certainly it was a notice. I was going to say something in regard to a boy twelve years old, but I will just let you infer what I intended to say. Now, I call upon him to examine these syllogisms and show that they are not correct, and that the conclusions are illogical and false. They stand like the rock Gibralter, immovable, unless he can show their error, as long as they stand. His theory with regard to repentance before faith is false, for his argument depends upon the fact that one is mentioned before the other, and not upon the fact as to their existence. Has he noticed those passages that I presented time and again? He has not. He has been as silent as the night of the grave. And why? Because he knows that if he mentions them his argument is gone to the winds—gone forever.

But, now, with regard to obedience and pardon following. He quoted a number of passages. Now, I state this, as found in the 16th verse of the 8th chapter of Romans—and I am

glad to have the opportunity of presenting what I regard as the proper theory with reference to this subject. Paul affirms, "The Spirit of God beareth witness with"—not to, not upon, not that it makes the impression upon our spirits, or testifies to our spirits, but "The Spirit of God beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God," that the Spirit of God bears witness with the spirit of the children of God, and that they both testified in order to the establishment of the truth of the proposition that we are the children of God; that we sustain this relation to the Divine One. But the quotation to which we refer makes feeling the evidence of pardon. In connection with this matter, I propose, to elaborate the subject more fully hereafter. I now state this proposition: I state that the Spirit of God never tells a man that he is pardoned when the gospel says he is not; to say he is pardoned when the gospel affirms that he is not, is to say, "I do not believe the gospel," and Jesus says he that believeth not the gospel shall be damned; and it never can be made to appear that the Spirit of God tells the man that he is pardoned when Jesus says he is damned. But when we come to investigate the gospel of Jesus Christ, we find the language of Jesus himself in the 16th chapter of Mark's record, 15th and 16th verses, in which Jesus uses these words: "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now, Jesus positively affirms, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Spirit of God never tells the man that he is pardoned, until the gospel tells him that he is pardoned, and the gospel does not tell him that he is pardoned until he believes and obeys it. The Spirit of God does not tell him so unless the Scriptures contradict themselves. While upon this point I want to call your attention to Dr. Lynd again, to show that he is not with the gentleman upon that subject, but that he sustains the position that I occupy. Now, we call your attention to this language: "When we be-

lieve in Jesus as our Lord, we put ourselves under his government in the way which he has appointed, that is, by baptism." He said, we put in parenthesis, "baptism." Dr. Lynd spoke of baptism as subjection; he said it was something else, and that we put in baptism there in parenthesis. Well, Mr. Lynd puts it in there himself, there is no parenthesis about it—"in the way which He has appointed"—that is, by baptism. "No saving faith can be exercised independently of this subjection." Now, what subjection? Here Lynd says, in the way which God has appointed, namely, by baptism, we put ourselves under his government. Now, no saving faith can exist independent of this subjection—putting ourselves under his government in the way that he has appointed, namely, by baptism. No saving faith without this subjection in the cases where it is required. No part of the New Testament warrants a man in anticipating salvation who does not come into subjection—the same subjection that he speaks of here—come into subjection to the government of Jesus Christ, in the way which he has appointed. How is it? Why, that is by baptism, says Dr. Lynd—God granting him life and opportunity to put on Christ. Lynd's work, pages 14 and 15: "Now, throughout this essay, and when we speak of a sinner's justification by faith we mean this kind of faith." What kind of faith? Why the kind of faith that embraces this subjection to Christ. Says Dr. Lynd, we do embrace this, and this is one of the elements of faith; and yet my friend would labor to make you believe that Dr. Lynd in the faith that justifies does not embrace this baptism, when he says in so many words, "Throughout this essay, when we speak of justification by faith, we mean this kind of faith, that has as an inherent element of submission to the authority of Jesus Christ." This baptism appears throughout—this putting on the authority and government of the Son of God, and thus putting on the Christ

My friend quoted a number of passages, "And he that believeth hath everlasting life," and so on; and he quotes a translation here and says, it is so and so, which is the correct one. I would just simply state that his translation there referred to, that it is not authority in this controversy or any where else, unless you should happen to get into a discussion with the individual himself; for he occupies no position of prominence or authority in the religious or literary world. But we want to know whether it is by faith alone. Now, I say this, that eternal life is promised to that individual who continues faithful in the service of God to the end. "Seek after glory, after honor, after immortality, that ye may obtain eternal life." Eternal life is the reward promised to that individual who seeks after glory, or honor—eternal life is the reward.

But now, again, in the 6th chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans:

"But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness, and have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life." You have become the servants of righteousness, you do right. And John says:

"Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as Christ," or, even as he is righteous you become servants of righteousness; you do righteousness, according to John, and have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. Now, the gentleman is bound to say that Paul does not tell the truth, that John does not tell the truth, or that this passage to which he refers, in which faith is mentioned, that it means more than faith alone; and when he says that it means more than faith alone, then he gives up the question. If he says it includes repentance, then I say that it is because repentance is required somewhere

else. He must answer, and if repentance is embodied because it is required somewhere else, then other things, I say, are required also, because they are mentioned somewhere else, and he must take the position clearly that it is by faith alone, or give up the question. It furnishes him no proof. He speaks again of the Acts of the Apostles. Now, I aver that the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit was to convince the Jews that the Gentiles had equal part and lot in the plan of redemption through Jesus Christ with the Jews, and that it had that effect; for when they saw it they were satisfied upon this question, and they glorified God, and said then has God granted unto the Gentiles repentance unto life. But, my friend, if that baptism was necessary to pardon, then you must stand condemned before God, and all your church, for you never have been baptized as was Cornelius and his household, and not a member of his church has been. He will not contend for it for a single moment. They have never been baptized in that way, not one of them. I now present these objections to the position of my friend, that the kingdom was established in the days of John, before the death of the Saviour. The first objection is this: If it was set up during the life of the Saviour, it was built without its foundation. "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a tried stone." This point we have already presented for your consideration.

Second—If the church existed during the natural life of Jesus, it existed without a priest; for Jesus was not a priest until he was set on the right hand of the throne of God. And this you can find clearly sustained in Psalm cx. 4, and Zachariah vi. 3, and again Hebrews viii. 4, where it is positively affirmed that he was not a priest on earth, according to the language of Paul; and, hence, if the church was established during his natural life, or while he was here in the world, the church existed without a priest, for Jesus was not a priest on earth.

Third—If the church existed while Jesus was on the earth,

it was without the Holy Spirit; for the Spirit was not yet given, for it was not given until Christ was glorified.—Read John vii. 39. Then they have no Holy Spirit, for "it had not yet been given," as Christ had not ascended. The same truth is found presented in the Acts of the Apostles ii. 36: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ," and because of this ascension and coronation "he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." The Holy Spirit was given according to the promise of the Saviour.

Fourth—It was without the gospel in its facts which saved sinners. I call your attention first to 1st Cor. xv. 1-3: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein you stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Now, I hold that this gospel could not be preached in fact until the facts were established by his actual death, burial and resurrection.

Fifth—If the government of Christ was set up during his stay on earth, it was without a king. The two passages following I will call your attention to as proof. Acts ii. 36-38, where Jesus is spoken of as coronated at the right hand of the Majesty on high. And, again, Philippians ii. 9-11: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

The sixth objection is this: If the kingdom of Jesus the Christ existed before his death, then there existed at the same

time two different kingdoms, with different laws and ordinances and subjects, and both existing at the same time under the divine sanction. There was a kingdom before the kingdom of Jesus Christ existed—the gentleman will not deny this—that existed under divine sanction. John was a member of it; Jesus was a member of it, and the apostles were members of that kingdom, but that kingdom never was established or set up until Jesus upon the cross bowed his head in death, and exclaimed, "It is finished." We say, if there was another kingdom established prior to the death of the Saviour, then there were two kingdoms existing at the same time, with different laws, with different ordinances, and both under the divine sanction at the same time. We present these objections to the theory of my friend with regard to the beginning and the establishment and existence of this organization for which he contends. I state, in regard to his church, or in regard to any other church, as being established before the death of Christ receiving the divine sanction, that no such thing existed as a church that stood at that time, or at any time, as established by divine authority. For hundreds and hundreds of years you can not read of his church, for his church had no existence in the Bible or any other history. In the year 1522, we have the first announcement of the existence of his church as an independent organization existing in the world. And we want you to keep these facts before your minds, that you may determine when we shall have passed through this investigation, where the truth is, and where true safety may be found.

We desire also to present before your minds, again, this argument with reference to the communion. He refers to the communion—and I do not want you to forget the point that we make upon that subject—we state, that there are those whom the gentleman admits are the children of God, as good as himself, and yet he will not admit them to the table of God. —[Time Expired.]

Eighth Evening.

ELDER RAY'S NINTH ADDRESS.

Mr. Ray—I suggest that the Moderators, not to take up the time of discussion, be permitted to read their criticisms upon the passages about which we differ first, and then we shall go on with our debate.

President Smith—A matter of criticism having been referred to President Cook and myself, I submit the following: I understand Dr. Ray's position on Acts ii. 38 to be as follows: The two commands, *metanoēsate* and *baptisthētō*, are not united in order to procure the same result, because they have two different persons and numbers, and consequently have different objects. Dr. Lucas contends that although these verbs are of different persons and numbers, they are addressed to the same persons, and have in view the same end. The following passages are introduced by Dr. Lucas, confirming his position taken on Acts ii. 38, 1st Cor. xiv. 39, 40. Here we have *zēloute* and *kōluete* in the second person plural, impertive, and *ginesthō* in the third person singular, imperative. While these verbs have grammatically different subjects, the commands expressed by them are in fact addressed to the same persons. As to the object of these verbs I submit the following: Imperatives connected by a conjunction, expressed or implied, have the same object, unless a different object is

expressed or necessarily implied. Different objects are not here expressed, nor are different objects necessarily implied. I conclude they have the same object. In 1st Cor. xvi. 13, 14, we have *grēgoreite*, *stēkete*, *andrizesthe*, and *krataiousthe*, in the second person plural, imperative, and *ginesthō* in the third person, imperative. I understand these verbs to be addressed to the same persons and to have the same object in view. In *ginesthō* we have in that passage third person singular, imperative; and I understand the same persons are addressed in these verbs with the same object in view as in the preceding verbs. The passages introduced by Dr. Lucas [1st Cor. xiv. 39, 40, and xvi. 13,14, and Acts ii. 38] are parallel in so far as the subject and object of the verbs in the second person plural, imperative, where connected are concerned. In Acts ii. 38, and parallel passages, second person plural, imperative, takes its subject collectively, while the third person singular, imperative, in the same passage, takes, in fact, the same subject individually and distributively. That is my criticism.

President Cook—It is not denied by Brother Ray, or by myself, that the language is addressed to the same persons. We are willing to admit that all of 1st and 2d Corinthians were addressed to the same persons. That is not the question, as I understand it, in dispute. You might as well have taken Romans as an example, and select every verb, and say, because they are addressed to the same persons that they are parallel! Brother Ray has put it in this form:

President Cook—Dear Brother: As regards the reply of Dr. Lucas to my criticism on Acts ii. 38, last Friday, I ask the following questions:

"Are those verbs referred to by him [1st Cor. xiv. 37] found in that verse?"

I reply, no.

"Second—Have the verbs he named the same grammatical subject?"

I reply, no.

"Are they of the same tense as *metanoēsate* and *baptisthētō* in Acts ii. 38?"

I answer, no.

"Are they joined by the conjunction *kai*, to obtain the same result?"

I answer, no.

"Are those examples given by Dr. Lucas from 1st Cor. xiv. —, the verse you have left blank, Brother Ray.

Mr. Lucas—Yes, xiv. 39, 40, were the ones quoted.

Mr. Cook—We did not understand it so.

"Are these examples given by Dr. Lucas from 1st Cor. 39, 40, and xvi. 13, 14, parallel in construction with *metanoēsate kai baptisthētō* in Acts ii. 38?"

We reply, *no*, to all these questions.

ARGUMENT OF MR. RAY.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, and Ladies and Gentlemen—I feel thankful to the giver of all good, our great Creator, for the privilege of again standing in the presence of this intelligent audience in the advocacy of the proposition which has been read in your hearing, that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics which entitle them to be regarded as the visible church or kingdom of Jesus Christ. As regards the criticism I made, I thought I knew what I was doing. I had consulted no one upon that subject when I made it, and according to the decision of President Cook, in whose ability I have the utmost confidence, I am correct upon that subject. But I again repeat, *that where two Greek verbs are connected by the conjunction kai, with a view to the same result, in the New Testament, as far as I have examined, they are in the same number, with the same subject, and with the same*

construction throughout. I wish to read, before I advance with my argument, a statement or two in regard to the doctrine of baptismal salvation, as I have before me some historical authorities in regard to the rise of that error. I read from Waddington's History of the Church, p. 37 :

"The original simplicity of the office of baptism had already undergone some corruption. The symbol had been gradually exalted at the expense of the thing signified, and the spirit of the ceremony was beginning to be lost in its form. Hence, a belief was gaining ground among the converts, and was inculcated among the heathen, that the act of baptism gave remission of all sins committed previously to it." I read also from Neander's History of the Three First Centuries, page 199:

"But while, on the one hand, the doctrine of the corruption and guilt, inherited by human nature, as the consequence of the first transgression, was reduced into a more systematic and distinct form, [which was particularly the case in the North African Church, as we find in the history of the doctrines of Christianity,] and on the other, from the want of a proper distinction between the external and internal things of baptism (the baptism of water, and the baptism of the spirit), the error was gaining ground, and becoming more firmly established that without outward baptism no one could be freed from that inherited guilt, could be saved from the eternal punishment which threatened him, or brought to eternal happiness; and while the error of the magical effects of the sacrament was constantly obtaining more and more sway, the theory of the *unconditional necessity of infant baptism* was developed." Here is the testimony of Neander, showing that the symbolic design of baptism was perverted in early times. We have the testimony of Miall, page 368, this historian says: "In the ante-Nicene period sin was regarded much more in its overt demonstrations than in its spiritual destructiveness; repentance had degenerated into penance; regeneration into baptism; justification by faith into

just what the nineteenth number of 'The Tracts for the Times' declares it to be; and sanctification was lost in the names of sacred persons, sacred things, and sacred places. All this was before the Papacy had begun to blazon its triple crown, or to set its feet upon the necks of kings."

There is the historic proof that among these corrupt churches this doctrine, baptismal salvation, was gaining ground.

Again, I wish to call your attention to a short statement from Dr. Lynd, upon the design of baptism, page 32: "We can not be figuratively sprinkled or poured into Christ's death, or into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but we can be figuratively immersed into both." And, again, he says [page 41]: "He who holds that the death of Christ is a real atonement for sin, and the procuring cause of salvation; that justification is by faith alone; and that this is the only righteousness in which we can meet the claims of the divine law and its penalty, is not likely to go astray when he asserts the necessity of baptism to salvation." Thus showing that Dr. Lynd understands that this salvation, or washing away of sins in baptism, is *figurative* and *declarative*, and that the real justification is by faith, or, as he expresses it very strongly, when he says, "*faith alone.*"

I wish your attention now to some points in a former speech. The question of communion was pressed very earnestly by my friend; *that we are not the church of Christ, because we are wrong as regards the Lord's table*—the Lord's Supper. He continues to appeal to the passage, that he ought to have understood better, in the 1st Cor. 11th chapter: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." He certainly knows that this was addressed to the church at Corinth. All the members of the church had been baptized; they were in church fellowship. This has no reference to those who were not members of the church, whether Christians or not, communing. The repeated assertion that we ex-

clude from the Lord's table those that God had received—those whom we admit to be God's children. I deny that we exclude any one. We invite every child of God to the Lord's table, according to the Lord's plan; and as the Lord's table is in his kingdom, and in church fellowship, we invite them into the house of the Lord, and then to the table according to the rule of the Saviour. The Saviour himself has made the way somewhat *narrow*. I do not complain because of it. He said, Matt. vii. 14: "Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." But my friend upon this subject would say, "*wide is the way;* let all be admitted to the communion, whether converted or not; let them come to the Lord's table if they think themselves worthy, and take a notion to eat and drink; let them examine themselves!" Suppose the Dr. had old Brigham Young here, and the prophet should say, "I will look into my heart a little; I am a very good provider, and a clever gentleman, and I will go to the gentleman's communion," and according to my friend's *open communion* system he must commune! And so with every other man of like character advocating heresy of any sort. I don't indorse such perversion or misconception of the design of the Lord's table. In this connection I will read upon this subject, showing the views of Moses Lard in reference to the Lord's table. In his Quarterly for 1863, page 50, he says: "We should delight to see the day come when the Baptists would relax a little their austere and unhallowed rules on this point, and when we and they at least should enjoy the pleasure of cultivating more fraternal relations over the loaf and cup!" He wants to commune with the Baptists in a kind of courtship, cultivating friendly relations, when God Almighty has said: "Do this"—not in remembrance of thy mother, not in remembrance of thy brother or friend, but—"in remembrance of me." Whenever you commune for friendship, to show your love to friends, you have

failed to discern the Lord's body; and you are guilty of idolatry in the sight of the living God. We ought to understand what we are doing when we approach the Lord's table: it is to "show the Lord's death till he comes," not to show Christian fellowship, not to show even church fellowship. Jesus Christ in that upper room invited no one there, except that little band already in fellowship in that primary organization. Then it is unnecessary to waste any more time on the subject. We simply wish to obey the commands of Christ. Dear friends, I can not find one example where communion was held with those not in fellowship in any of the apostolic churches. This is a modern innovation, gotten up, it seems, for favor with the world.

But, then, my friend made himself very merry over some syllogisms he got up in regard to repentance, and I believe I have the leading idea. First, he says spiritual life is commenced in faith; that *faith is the commencement of spiritual life* —from Dr. Jeter. Second, *repentance is a part of spiritual life; therefore, faith is the beginning of repentance.* Now, I will simply state the Dr. has made a mistake, and his syllogism is wrong, because his minor premise is false. I call his attention to the fact that repentance is unto spiritual life, in order to it. This is found in Acts xi. 18: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life," *tēn metanoian edōken eis zōēn.* Here, then, we find this repentance according to his rendering in Acts ii. 38, is repentance *in order to* spiritual life, *unto* life. And now I will construct a syllogism, if the gentleman will give attention to it. First, heart faith—you remember that is almost a Bible expression, for it is faith with the heart—*heart faith is the commencement of spiritual life* —Jeter.

Second, *repentance is in order to spiritual life*—Acts xi. 18—*therefore, repentance is in order to heart faith.* There is a syllogism based upon truth, upon the facts of the case. No

man can have faith *with the heart*, whose faith has not been superinduced by repentance. The Dr. says, sorrow is before faith; *that faith is the source of all true obedience; therefore faith is the source of repentance.* Now, there is a sophism lurking in that syllogism. I will just give him another—just add a word or two and make the same one look a little singular. First, *the source of all true obedience embraces hearing the word and receiving the truth.* Second, *faith is the source of all our obedience; therefore, faith is the source of hearing the word!* Then according to that syllogism you have faith before you have heard the word! It is just as true as his; and it is reduced to an absurdity. So his syllogism falls to the ground.

In reference to the order, my friend has not noticed those passages of Scripture critically, to show why they were in the wrong order. I did not base my argument simply because one is named before the other. He has mistaken the argument. I stated that one is mentioned *in order to* the other. "*Ye repented not afterward that ye might believe.*" He has not examined this testimony of Jesus. This is the testimony of Jesus; and if I am wrong, Jesus and the apostles are wrong. We are in splendid company. Because we hold the order in which they preached, the gentleman is opposing us! Yes, because we are following Christ!! That is the ridiculous attitude in which he finds himself.

He says, I ought to notice John iii. 5, where baptism comes before the birth of the Spirit. He has not proved that *born of water* there means baptism. And if it does, I wish to know how it is; and because, my friend says, Christian baptism began on the day of Pentecost, and this was before! Jesus spoke of something which existed at that time; so his whole theory of setting up the kingdom falls to the ground. He says that there was no Christian kingdom or baptism at that time. Let him try again.

But, then, he says (Eph. ii. 20), concerning *the foundation*

of apostles and prophets. But he does not believe that those prophets were Old Testament prophets. So his argument is worthless so far as that is concerned. That is what he said in a former discussion. Here, then, according to his own testimony, he has made an argument of no force. The apostles were made repositories of the oracles of God, and they quoted from the prophets and incorporated the doctrine of the prophets with their own teachings. The plan of salvation held by the prophets was a part of the foundation.

But, my friend says, the Spirit of God never tells a man he is pardoned, if the gospel says he is not. He refers to Mark xvi. 16. Well, I agree to that. I have shown that when one believes in Christ, the Spirit of God says he has *eternal life.* It tells the truth. When one is baptized, that will not take eternal life away from him. If he has really believed, through faith, as Mr. Campbell said in regard to Paul's sins, they are really pardoned, and formally washed away in baptism. That is, as Dr. Lynd would say, *figurative* salvation in baptism—not the real. Salvation is by grace, through faith, not of ourselves, but it is the gift of God.

But Romans vi. 17, he emphasized *obeying from the heart* the gospel, and *then* being made free from the law of sin and death; and, yet, when I pressed him, he says, I did not say it was baptism! What do you mean when you say *obeying from the heart?* The exercise of faith is with the heart; and obedience growing out of that, obeying from the heart. Mr. Campbell's translation of that passage is: "But thanks to God, that although ye were the slaves of sin, yet ye have obeyed from the heart the mould of doctrine unto which ye were delivered. And being made free from sin, ye have become the slaves of righteousness."—[In the Living Oracles.]

The Dr. said (Acts x. 43-47) that the gift of the Spirit on that occasion, at the house of Cornelius, before baptism, did not prove that these Gentiles were children of God, but it was

simply bestowed in order to show to the Jewish disciples that the Gentiles might come in! If he will read, he will find in the prophecy of Joel, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the miraculous administration and power of the Holy Spirit, was to be bestowed upon none but those who were servants, not enemies of God.

The kingdom before the day of Pentecost. The Dr. presents several difficulties. *First*, the foundation: that before the day of Pentecost the Dr. declares that Jesus was not a suitable foundation for the kingdom until after he died upon the cross! Well, I find it is said in 1st Cor. x. 4, that the Israelites all drank of the "same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." This is the very same word in the original, translated rock in Matt. xvi. 18, "*Petra ēn ho Christos.*" There, in the same language and construction with that in Matt. xvi. 18, and with the same gender, *rock* (*Petra*) *was Christ.* Tell me he was not a suitable foundation! when he called himself the foundation, and when Peter confessed him as this rock right there! And yet he tells you he was not a suitable foundation. His argument indicates to me that he is drifting toward Unitarianism—denying the full divinity of the Son of God.

Second—Then the Dr. said, if the church was set up before the day of Pentecost, that it was without a priest. Why, dear friends, when we take God's word we find Jesus was a "priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec," the only Mediator between an offended God and offending men. Men were saved under the old dispensation by what—atonement? Don't he know that Jesus Christ is represented as the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"—a priest, then, forever? But, he says, he was not a priest on earth. Of course he was not a priest after the Aaronic order upon earth, officiating according to the law. But when we examine the connection, we find that he is not a priest under the Mosaic dispensation,

after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedec. I contend that Jesus Christ was the officiating priest in the salvation of Abel, and will be forever the priest; for if he was not, then none in the Old Testament are saved; because, if they were, they were saved without a priest to atone for them. He is drifting to the doctrine of Unitarianism, it seems to me.

Third—Another of the Dr.'s objections is, that the kingdom was without the Holy Spirit, if it was set up prior to Pentecost. But if he will examine John xx. 22, he will find that the Saviour breathed on them and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." When they first believed they were children of God, they were born of the Spirit. And when it is said (Luke vii. 39) that the Holy Spirit was not yet given, it was the baptism of the Holy Spirit that was to lead them to all truth, to enable them to speak with tongues, and give them full inspiration.

Fourth—The Dr. said, if the church was set up before Pentecost, it was without the gospel in fact. Well, dear brethren, it was *gospel* enough to save poor sinners from the Devil's hell. Jesus said, he had on earth power to forgive sins. He said to the man sick with palsy: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." To the poor woman: "Thy faith hath saved thee." Yet, the Dr. tells you that he didn't have the gospel. His death was preached—Jesus told them he was going to die on the cross. As I have quoted, the efficacy of that death extended back to the beginning.

Fifth—But my friend says, that they were without a kingdom; that Jesus was not King until the day of Pentecost! The Bible tells me that nothing was made only by *Him*. All the universe was made by the omnipotent power of Jesus; yet he was not a King! He was called a King when he was born in the manger of Bethlehem. He was called a King when he rode in triumph into the city of Jerusalem. When before

Pilate's bar, he confessed he was a King. Pilate accosted him, "Art thou a king, then," and Jesus answered, "To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world." But it is hardly necessary to pursue this further. We have shown that he had the power of heaven and earth before the day of Pentecost, when he gave the great commission under which the church is laboring to-day. He claimed all power of heaven and earth. What more power did he have on Pentecost? All this talk about being coronated on the day of Pentecost, which the gentleman indulges in, he does not find in his Bible. That is part of the Bethany dialect.

Again, the Dr. says, there are two kingdoms, then, if the kingdom was up before Pentecost. Yes, there were two kingdoms, one political, and one religious. If you are a loyal citizen of this state, you are in a political organization; and if you belong to the kingdom of Christ, you obey the laws of *that* kingdom. They do not come in conflict with each other. Paul was obedient to the Jewish law long after the day of Christ. I have the testimony here of God's word: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Then again, "for all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." Then again, "from the days of John the Baptist, until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent taketh it by force."

But I wish to advance another argument—one more, my ninth. *The Baptists possess the Bible characteristics of the true church or kingdom of Jesus Christ, because they have passed through the wilderness of obscurity.* No other church upon the earth has ever passed through such a period of history. The church of Rome mounted upon the scarlet beast, with those frightful words of terror on her forehead, was never secreted or hid in the wilderness, but her history is emblazoned on the pages of every historian. It is treasured up in the archives of the

nations. Also, we have the plain and direct history of every other denomination, except the Baptists. No man can tell their headship unless he goes to Jesus. And up to this time my friend has not told you who was the founder of the Baptist church. I think he had the temerity to say they did not have an existence before 1522, yet he don't prove it. *I defy him to prove it.* It is not in history, and he can not find it so stated by any authentic historian. He has made a statement and I call upon him to *retract or prove it.* There is not a word that will indicate such a state of things, that Baptists had no existence prior to the time stated. If the gentleman has the proof, he don't give it. I want the proof in denying our claims, but he don't take time to give the proof! But he sets himself up as a man of greater authority than Alexander Campbell. He reminds me of a small boy who sometimes gets his father's clothes on and struts about and imagines himself larger than his father! It seems the gentleman aims to get above Alexander Campbell in point of authority in these great matters. But, then, to the proof [Revelations xii. 14]: "And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent." And again [Revelations xii. 6]: "And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared by God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three score days." Mr. Orchard, in his history, page 61, says: "In 412, the Baptists were banished as heretics. In 413, Innocent sent letters of advice to various ministers. In the same year, the Baptists, for rebaptizing, were sentenced to death. In 416, a Council at Mela, *accursed* all those who denied forgiveness to accompany infant baptism, and in 418, a Council, at Carthage, enforced the same curse."

It is then a historic fact that these ancient Baptists were

punished in that early time. But I wish to call your attention, now, to the testimony of Mr. Brown upon the subject. The gentleman made a statement that Mr. Brown, the editor of the Religious Encyclopedia, was against us on this important subject. [Page 188]: "It has been asserted that the Baptists originated in Germany, about the year 1522, at the beginning of the Reformation. It is true that no denomination of Protestants can trace the origin of its present name further back than about the time of the Reformation; and most of them have originated since that period. And it appears to be true that the name of Baptists, by which these people have since been known, was then first assumed, probably in opposition to that of Anabaptists, with which their enemies were continually reproaching them."—[TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' NINTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My friend has just quoted a passage that I have marked, and which I have before quoted to sustain exactly what I have said with regard to the Baptist church and its remote origin. In this connection I will read, because the matter is fresh in your minds. "It has been asserted that the Baptists originated in Germany, about the year 1522." That is pretty near what I said, is it not? "In the year 1522, at the beginning of the Reformation. It is true that no denomination of Protestants can trace the origin of its present name further back than to the time of the Reformation." No church can trace its name back further than the Reformation, according to that statement, "and most of them have originated since that period. It appears to be true that the name of Baptists, by which these people have since been called, was then first assumed, probably in opposition to that of Anabaptists, with which their enemies were continually reproaching them." Now, here is authority upon this subject, and I venture the assertion that he can not find the history of his Baptist church beyond that point. He can not do it. It has no history beyond that point.

But we come to notice now the criticisms referred to. The gentleman says that President Cook sustains him. Well, I have the pleasure of saying that President Smith sustains me in the position that I have taken upon these passages. Now, I will come out one ahead, for not only President Smith but Dr. Hackett, the Baptist translator for the Bible Union, also

sustains me, especially on the 2d of the Acts of the Apostles. I will read that, so we will be a little in advance on this criticism, and the ideas taught in the passage upon which the controversy has arisen. Dr. Hackett says: "*eis aphesin amartiōn*, in order to forgiveness of sins, we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive and object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other."

Mr. Ray—Let me have that book for a moment.

Mr. Lucas—I will, Sir. That is what Dr. Hackett says upon the question, and we have given you an example from Euripedes, that the gentleman has never yet shown that our position was false, as far as our criticism is concerned. We gave you the rule in Kühner's Greek Grammar, sustaining the position that we took. We stated further, that the form of expression is very frequent. I gave you at least one example. I could give you a hundred. I say, "Here is a contractor, whose business is that of building houses." He has a number of hands. He says to these hands: "All of you go, and let each man bring his tools." Now, then, I say that, "let each man bring his tools," embraces just as many as "all of you" together. The only difference is, the one refers to one individual, while the other verb and command refers to them collectively. That is the only difference, and I could give you hundreds of examples of this kind, and illustrate precisely this point in the Acts of the Apostles. So much for criticism. We are willing it should go to the record just as you have it.

With regard to the charge he made in respect to the Lord's Supper, and the passage, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat," while we say that this language was addressed to the church at Corinth, there is no controversy about the persons addressed; but the difficulty with my friend is that he says that there are persons who are children of God, and

yet not in fellowship with him. Paul addressed children of God. My friend says that there are children of God just as good as he is—to whom Paul would say, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." But my friend says, "No, I will examine you, and tell you not to eat." There is the position of the gentleman. He admits these persons are children of God, and just as good as he is; but instead of allowing those whom he acknowledges to be children of God to examine themselves and so to eat, he and his church examine them and tell them not to eat. That is the position he occupies. But he is not only wrong in regard to some who are not connected with his church, but also with respect to persons who come into it as he and his brethren came into the church, for they will not partake of the Lord's Supper with all the Baptists, as we have shown you. Here are the different orders of Baptists, as the "Regular Baptists," the "Particular Baptists," the "Seventh-Day Baptists," and the "Free-Will Baptists," whom his church does not invite to the Lord's table. He will not commune with those, and yet they came into it according to the plan of my friend, he being the judge, although they have taken precisely the same steps. But even his own church of the same faith and order take the position—at least many of them—that the members of the church at LaGrange, when they happen to visit the church at Canton, have no right to commune at the Lord's table with the church at Canton. Many of them—if I have not been incorrectly informed—have taken time and again this position, and even our worthy friend President Cook has taken this position, as I have been informed, in regard to members of one church communing with another. Well, consequently, we say that he departs from the rule as presented in the word of God. While the Bible says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat," they say, "We will examine you, and you shall not eat." There is a departure here. With regard to the design of the Lord's

Supper, we think that it is to commemorate the death and suffering of the Lord Messiah. We think we understand that fully. I would like to have your attention to this matter.

MODERATOR—Go ahead.

MR. LUCAS—But you are drawing more attention than I am. I simply say in regard to Pres. Cook, I do not know whether it is so or not. I simply heard it. I state that is the position taken by many of his church.

PRES. COOK—Perhaps it would not be out of place to explain my position, inasmuch as the gentleman has made the charge.

MR. LUCAS—Not at all, if you do not take it out of my time.

PRES. COOK—I wish to give you the benefit of all you have heard.

MR. LUCAS—Yes.

PRES. COOK—My position is that the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, that it is a religious family matter, like the Passover under the old Jewish dispensation—and that the church at LaGrange has no right to call a pastor or to exercise discipline in the Canton church. That a member of the LaGrange church has no right to go there and demand as a right to commune with that people. If he enjoys that privilege, it is simply a courtesy that may be extended to him; or, in other words, we believe that everything should have its place.

MR. LUCAS—We are not so far wrong after all. I am glad to have a witness testifying to our position. Now, here is the Lord's table; and we affirm that the Lord's people have a right to the Lord's table. If they have a right to the Lord's table, they have the right to demand the exercise and enjoyment of that right, as children of God, in the Lord's house, at the Lord's table; but, as you have heard, the position which the gentleman occupies is that they have no right to demand

it. If my friend, or his church, extend them the courtesy, why then they can eat; but this is in direct contravention to this rule presented by the apostle, when Paul says, "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat." But the position of the gentleman is that they can not eat. We will examine you, they say, and you can not eat, unless we extend to you the courtesy of invitation. You have no right at all to be allowed at the Lord's table, though you are the children of God according to the position of his church. If we extend an invitation to you to eat, you may; but if we do not, you may not—you can not. It is a "direct innovation." The inspired apostle says: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat."

I did not get the syllogism of the gentleman, but I will say that if he will furnish it I will examine it. I did not get it as he stated it, but I want to call your attention to the syllogisms again to which your minds were invited on my part. My friend did not get them exactly. I submit them again, and every one who has ever studied logic will see at once that the gentleman's remarks with regard to the premises from which we endeavored to draw our deduction show that the gentleman was mistaken upon the question. Now, the premises that we present is this, spiritual life is commenced in faith. That he believes—is indorsed by Mr. Jeter. Mr. Jeter affirms that spiritual life is commenced in faith. Repentance is essential to spiritual life, therefore repentance is commenced in faith. That is the first syllogism. The second one is this: All true obedience embraces repentance. Faith is the source of all true obedience, therefore faith is the source of repentance. These are the syllogisms as presented by me in this discussion. And when I come to examine Dr. Lynd, I find that he indorses precisely what Mr. Jeter has affirmed here, in regard to faith being the source of all spiritual life, and of all true obedience; for he affirms, as we have before quoted, that if a man believes, he will repent, showing that his faith antedates

his repentance, and that the repentance follows the effect of the existence of true faith in his heart. That is the language of Dr. Lynd, upon the question. But we will call your attention to a passage from Dr. Lynd, in order to show that the position assumed by him, and the quotations made from Dr. Lynd, were not correct, and that he was not representing Dr. Lynd properly upon the subject. He quotes from the 41st page of Dr. Lynd's work, on the "Design of Baptism," and reads a few lines, in which he embraced this declaration, "that justification is by faith alone," and we call your attention to the fact that he embodied in this declaration baptism, that is, submission or subjection to the Lord Messiah, and stated that when he used the term faith, and that the believer was justified by faith, that he desired that it should be understood throughout this essay that he embraced this obedience, that it was an inherent element of faith that justifieth. We call your attention to the language of Dr. Lynd here, where my friend stopped. We will begin to read, however, the passage that he read: "He who holds that the death of Christ is a real atonement for sin, and the procuring cause of salvation, that justification is by faith alone, and that that is the only righteousness in which we can meet the claim of the divine law and its penalties, is not likely to go astray when he asserts the necessity of baptism to salvation." Now, the gentleman read that far, I will read a little farther.

Whether we can understand it fully or not, it is a precious promise. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This is the very next utterance that Dr. Lynd gives, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Right here, you see, almost the entire opposite page is taken up presenting this very same truth, that it here presents; showing that this baptism and subjection to Christ is necessary in order to the enjoyment of the promised salvation and remission of sins. In fact, I never saw a work published of the same size,

upon the design of baptism, where it is asserted as often in some form or other, that baptism is for the remission of sins, as is asserted here in this very work of Dr. Lynd's. But, he calls our attention again, or rather he wants our attention to John iii. 5—not again—for he never has mentioned it so far as any recollection serves me in this discussion before, and then he refers to Eph. ii. 19. In John it is affirmed, except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God; and the religious world understand the water here to refer to baptism, and we can give you a number of Baptist authorities upon this question, were it necessary, as McLean, Orchard's History, and I might go on and name, or, as before stated, quote a number of others, if it were necessary; but the religious world generally say that it has reference to baptism, and here it is mentioned as in this order; and if, as the gentleman claims this order, it has any force, then we say that baptism is before the operation of the spirit. In regard to Ephesians, we say, and said in the former discussion, we do not believe the prophets there referred to were Old Testament prophets. So I have stated, and so I state now. I think the apostle here has reference to a different class of prophets than my friend has reference to, and he affirms that the passage refers to Jewish prophets, and because the apostles are mentioned first, therefore they come first. They do come first according to this argument; then the apostles are older than the prophets, and we present this as an *argumentum ad hominem*. It is a good argument to him, and he ought to consider and to look at it closely. And now, he says, he does not believe that simply from the fact that one is mentioned before the other that it does necessarily come first. He says the argument is not founded upon that at all, but it is founded upon this, that repentance unto life is necessary in order to the production of faith. This we deny. Now we come to a direct issue here. Let him prove it. We are prepared to meet the gentleman

upon that question. We aver that there is no repentance unto life, unto salvation, that it is not wrought by godly sorrow; godly sorrow works repentance unto life that needeth not to be repented of, and we aver that this godly sorrow is the result of the office of faith upon the human heart; the heart being purified by faith, the man becomes sorry for his sins. This godly sorrow is the result of the office of faith upon his heart; and this godly sorrow, this faith that excites it, works repentance unto salvation that needeth not to be repented of. As Dr. Lynd says, a man who thus thoroughly believes will repent.

Mr. Ray—I deny his position squarely upon this subject.

Mr. Lucas—But he that believes, has eternal life. We deny that the passage teaches that by faith alone, or faith only, that a man wins eternal life, and the passage does not teach it; but we believe by faith we obtain eternal life, but not by faith alone. There is the issue. It is not whether it is by faith, but whether it is by faith alone. We believe that the farmer toils by faith. If he had no faith, he would not work. He farms by faith, but not by faith alone. Faith alone would bring into his garner no crop. He farms by faith, but not by faith alone. He enjoys the fruits of the earth by faith, but not by faith alone. He has to work a little, in order that his faith be profitable. So, here we obtain eternal life by faith, but not by faith alone. Paul affirms that when the individual obeys from the heart the form of doctrine, that he is made free from sin, and becomes the servant of righteousness, and has his fruit unto holiness, and in the end everlasting life—he becomes the servant of righteousness. John says: "He that doeth righteously is righteous, even as he is righteous becomes the servant of righteousness, doing righteousness has his fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." It is not faith alone, but it is faith and doing righteousness according to these passages of Scripture, and this faith is dead without works according to the state-

ment of the inspired apostle; just as the body without the spirit is dead, even so faith without works is dead also. This is the language of James.

But as to Jesus and the foundation. We state that Jesus entered not into the foundation until he became a tried stone —until he was tried. The gentleman has talked around the question, but he has not affirmed in square terms that he was the foundation, and the church was built upon him before he became a tried stone. This stone that the builders rejected after he had been tried, as we have seen, became the head of the corner, and when he was tried the church was built upon him in accordance with the declaration of the Saviour to Peter, when he says, "Upon this rock will I—*will* I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And in accordance with the declaration in Ephesians, the church was built upon this foundation, the one new man, one new body, and it became one new church—was established upon this foundation when the middle wall of partition was taken away, by Jesus nailing it to the cross. It was not, then, built before this time, but it was after this time. If after this time, the gentleman's idea with regard to the establishment of the kingdom of Jesus Christ is false, and stands opposed to the teaching of the word of God.

But, the gentleman says our position looks to Unitarianism. Well, dear friends, it certainly was necessary for the gentleman to tell you of this, or you would never have known it. We state that Jesus was both God and man. He was as truly man as he was truly God, and he was as divine as God himself on the one hand, and was as human as his mother on the other. He was *God-man*—the "Logos" which was with God, and was God, and was made manifest in the flesh. This is our position upon that subject, as we have stated in the hearing of this people, and labored to prove, as no doubt many of you will recollect. We have, we think, established from

the word of God the glorious character and divine nature of the Son of God—divine as God himself on the one hand, and human as his mother on the other, in the relation that he sustained to his mother; and hence he was a proper and perfect mediator, who could lay hold of humanity with one hand, and lay hold with the other upon the eternal Father, and was thoroughly and perfectly a mediator between God and man.

My friend quotes, "the law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of God is preached." Well, we have had this matter up time and again. The gentleman has admitted the apostles were not called till after John was in prison, that Jesus never gave to them the kingdom till he went away, and consequently the kingdom was not established in the days of John when he preached the kingdom; and if he preached that before he was in prison, and the apostles were not called until after he was in prison, hence, at this time, the kingdom looked to the future. Since John the kingdom of God was preached as at hand, and the word of God positively declares that it was preached as yet to come. And Jesus, in the character of the nobleman in the parable, went to receive his kingdom, and did not receive it until he went away, and he did not go away till after he was dead, and buried, and rose again; consequently, he did not receive his kingdom till after that time, and it is perfectly useless for my friend to be talking about the kingdom being established before that time, unless he is willing to affirm in positive contradiction to the language of the word of God, that he received his kingdom and established it before he went away. But, with regard to the priesthood of the Saviour, it is positively asserted that he was not a priest on earth, but he was made a priest after the power of an endless life by the oath of the eternal Father—he was made a priest after the power of an endless life.—[TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S TENTH ADDRESS.

I wish to read, as I had well nigh forgotten, a statement in answer to a little reflection upon my motives at Blandinville, made a day or two ago. It is from the pastor of the church there, a very devoted and worthy brother. "This is to certify, that the statement that the Campbellites hired Elder D. B. Ray, at five dollars per day, to remain in Blandinville until Dr. Lucas came, *is false in every particular*. Brother Ray remained two weeks after the discussion was to have opened waiting for the coming of Dr. Lucas. It is true that T. H. Goodnight handed me, at his own suggestion, twenty dollars, which I gave to Brother Ray, but Brother Ray had nothing to do with the arrangement. J. H. DELANO, *Pastor Blandinville Baptist Church.*"

Here is another statement. It is made by a very worthy brother, named James R. Ward, who lives at Blandinville. "I saw Brother Goodnight to-day, and I asked him whether that was paid on demand, or at the request of the Baptists, or as a voluntary offer by them? He said it was a voluntary offer on their part; and that he paid the twenty dollars to Elder Delano, and not to you. The church requested you to come here, and was bound for your payment. The transaction, whatever it was, was with the two churches, as I verily believe."

I would not have read these letters; but at my own expense this discussion is to be published—and because it would have gone into the book as a reflection on my motives. I think the Dr. has been erroneously informed.

Now, then, in relation to Dr. Hackett. Let me read a little

in this connection: In his commentary on Acts xxii. 16: "*Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.*" Dr. Hackett says: "It answers to *eis áphesin àmartiōn* in ii. 38, *i. e.*, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, *because it is the sign of the repentance and faith which* are the conditions of salvation." Thus we see that even Dr. Hackett does not agree in doctrine with the gentleman, whatever may be the strong expressions made by him, as also made by others. Dr. Lynd says, when he ascribes salvation to baptism he does not do so in the same sense as when he ascribes it to faith. But before the Dr. sat down, he stated his belief that salvation or eternal life was not by faith alone. He says: "He that has faith only," —I understand by that when one truly believes in Christ with all his heart—" he is still destitute of spiritual life, or eternal life;" and he said, "it was by faith and works of righteousness." So I understood him; I think that is his statement. In reply, I read Romans iv. 3-6: "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now, to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." That is, so far as justification, in the sight of God is concerned, *it is without works.* There is one more passage of Scripture I desire to quote, which ought to satisfy my friend. I read from Paul's Epistle to Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Here is the difference between Paul and my friend. My friend says, *faith and righteousness which we have done*; Paul says, not by *works of right-*

eousness which we have done, but by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. He has contended, it seems to me, against the statement of God's precious book—his holy word.

When my time expired, I had just begun to read the testimony that he had depended upon to prove that the Baptists originated in the year 1522. *It is not so stated, and no history is found to that effect.* The writer here says that some have so stated—not speaking of any writers, not even quoting a report upon the subject. Now, I commence to read where he left off, as we both have read the same passage before, Religious Encyclopedia, page 188: "It is not, however, the history of a name, but the prevalence of the principles, which is the just object of attention with the student of ecclesiastical history." Mr. Brown had simply stated that the *name, as we now use it,* did not extend back before the Reformation, but the name Anabaptists did—the very same class of people. Mr. Brown continues: "The Baptists do not pretend that the primitive saints were called Baptists, but that all the primitive Christians were what would now be called by this name; and that there always has been a people on earth, from the introduction of Christianity, who have held the leading sentiment by which they now are, and always have been, distinguished, is a point which they most firmly believe, and undertake to prove." So it turns out that the Baptists, according to this authority, believe that their church has stood from the time of Christ until now. The author says, page 20, of the Baptist Martyrs: "The Baptists, though for the most part of the poor of the world, rich in faith only, and unknown to fame, as were the primitive Christians, have yet, in almost all ages, had of their number, men of the most eminent learning and ability, who died as martyrs to the faith. From the time of Novatian, indeed, it has been customary with their adversaries to call the whole body by the name of its most

distinguished leader, as if they were a new sect, of which he was the originator. Thus the *Cathari* were called Novatians —then Paulicians—then Petrobrusians, Henricians, Josephists —then Arnoldists—Waldenses—Lollards—Mennonites; nor were they ever permitted to bear their present name of *Baptists* until after their legal toleration in England, in 1668. Yet to them, as we have seen, belong all the inspired writers of the New Testament—the sources of our Christian literature—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, James, Jude, Peter, and Paul himself, the accomplished pupil of Gamaliel." This is the testimony of the learned editor of the Encyclopedia. And Baptist Martyrs, page 17, the same writer has said, as quoted before: "That the Baptists have no difficulty whatever in tracing up their principles and their churches to the Apostolic age." I could quote further from this author, but it is not necessary.

My friend has been harping a good deal upon Mr. Benedict. I call attention, now, to his testimony in favor of the *succession* and perpetuity of the Baptists. On page 935, he says: "*Old School and Primitive Baptists* are appellations so entirely out of place, that I can not, even as a matter of courtesy, use them without adding, *so called*, or some such expression. I have seen so much of the missionary spirit among the old Anabaptists, Waldenses, and other ancient sects; so vigorous and perpetual were the efforts of those Christians, whom we claim as Baptists in the early, middle and later ages, to spread the gospel in all parts of the world, among all nations and languages where they could gain access, that it is plain that those who merely preach up predestination, and do nothing, have no claim to be called by their name. The farther down I go into the regions of antiquity, more fully is the missionary character of all whom we denominate our sentimental brethren developed. *Propagandism* was their motto and their watchword. They seldom went alone, but two and two was the order of their

going out; and such was the ardor of their zeal in their hazardous vocations, that no ordinary obstacles could alarm their fears or impede their progress."

Here we have the testimony of Benedict. Though he does not think the tracing of the succession necessary, and was not writing for the purpose of tracing it, yet he believes the facts existed; and he stated that if the facts were disclosed, a very good succession could be made out. My friend gave a beautiful illustration in this connection, when he said, if he had the money he could buy the rolling mill in this town. But he would draw the conclusion that there was no money in the world because he, Dr. Lucas, did not happen to have it! That would be a very strange conclusion. Now, because this man does not disclose the facts, therefore, the facts don't exist! If the Doctor's argument is worth anything, it proves that there is no money in the world, because Dr. Lucas has not got it!

Again, p. 51, Benedict says: "Of the *German Anabaptists* nothing need to be stated as to their denominational character; their name is their voucher for their dipping propensities, which runs back to a period so remote that the profoundest researches in antiquity can not ascertain their origin"—copying almost verbatim from Mosheim. Mr. Benedict continues: "The other parties, of which some accounts will be given, viz., the followers of Peter de Bruis, Henry, Huss, Wickliffe, &c., as well as Waldo, all held to the same principles as those of an earlier date. Thus we see the different companies lapped over each other, and covering the whole ground; and notwithstanding all the persecutions, gibbets, and flames, to which they were exposed, the interdicts, banishments and exile, which were their never-ceasing portion, they continued in great numbers up to the time of the Reformation." Thus, according to Benedict, these ancient sects overlapped each other. He did not think it important to trace their succes-

sion, but he contends that the church stood to the very time when our friend said our church did commence; and thus, by the help of Benedict and Dr. Lucas' admissions, we are able to establish the fact that our church has stood all the time. Right where Dr. Lucas could go no further, Benedict takes hold and makes out the *succession*, showing that the church, called "Baptist" now, has stood all the time.

But I wish to quote from the old history, Robinson's Ecclesiastical Researches, on this point. My friend quoted from Benedict's statement from Robinson. This work was published in 1792, I believe. It is an old English volume, with the long s'es. Robinson says, p. 55: "During the first three centuries, Christian congregations, all over the East, subsisted in separate independent bodies, unsupported by government, and consequently without any secular powers over one another. All this time they were *baptized churches.*" The old English writers, instead of using the term Baptist, when they wished to speak of the Baptist churches, they said "*Baptized congregations.*" Mr. Robinson continues: "And though all the fathers of the first four ages, down to Jerome, were of Greece, Syria and Africa, and though they give great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not one record of the baptism of a child till the year 370, when Galates, the dying son of Emperor Valens, was baptized by order of a monarch who swore he would not be contradicted." Then, again, we have the testimony of this writer on p. 126. He says: "In the end, Novatian formed a church, and was elected bishop. Great numbers followed his example all over the empire. Puritan churches were constituted, and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterward, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and a succession of them continued till the Reformation." Here is the proof that the *succession* of those driven out of

Italy about the year 425, when they moved to the wilderness surrounded by the Alpine mountains, had continued all the time. This is what is represented, as I understand it, by the beautiful symbol of the woman that fled into the wilderness. Page 510, Robinson's History, says: "Let it not seem romantic, if we suppose that [the] Waldenses, who, we know, studied the Revelation of John, thought themselves directed to retire, by God himself, to sequestered places; for, by the New Testament prophet, he had said, "The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three score days." Here we have the testimony of Mr. Robinson, the very one whom the gentleman has tried to array against us, proving the Baptist succession directly—*that the Baptists have stood as the church of the living God.* It has been proved, as certainly as God's eternal word is true, that *He* has a church on earth that has stood from the beginning; and that it is the Baptist church there can be no sort of doubt in my mind. Then I wish to call your attention to some of my friend's objections to the claims of the Baptists. He states they are not the church of Christ, because they are wrong in their commencement. They have not the exact *theory* of the time of the setting up of the church; and, therefore, they can not be the true church of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ! Now, my friends, it looks a little strange that he should make such a charge. Has he not stated that there was a people of God all the time from Christ until now; and yet, he says, they were in Babylon! On a former occasion, he said: "Out of the visible kingdom of Christ there is no forgiveness." He don't believe in the invisible kingdom on earth; he said a kingdom of Christians *here*—of saints; otherwise, there is no forgiveness of sins. For if he gets a person's sins forgiven before they enter into the kingdom, then they are forgiven without the remission of sins, according to the Doctor's position, which he certainly will not hold.

Now, in regard to his position on the setting up of the kingdom, he has said that is correct, because the Saviour was asked by the disciples whether he would at this time restore the kingdom of Israel. I have the testimony of Dr. Adam Clarke, that they asked the question about the wresting of the authority of the government from the Roman power. It was a political question. They were not talking of that spiritual kingdom of which the Saviour said: "My kingdom is not of this world."

But, again, in connection with this, he spoke of that nobleman that was to go into a far country, to receive a kingdom, and return, according to the parable. Well, dear friends, the Saviour is that nobleman, and as the nobleman went to receive a kingdom, it is certainly a perversion of the parable to say that he went to receive a kingdom, and returned on the day of Pentecost! There are only *two comings* of the Son of God represented in God's word. The first is when he came as a babe in the manger, and the second, when he is to come with all his holy angels. Now, to talk about this parable having reference to the setting up of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost, is talking that which is not consistent with God's word. The gentleman is mistaken on that point. He quotes Eph. ii.: *The middle wall of partition being broken.* Well, the Gentiles were not brought in on the day of Pentecost. Perhaps it was ten or twelve years after; but, according to the gentleman's argument, this whole theory of Pentecost and the setting up of the church is overthrown. And he would have the house of Cornelius brought in at that time! He has a strange interpretation, it seems to me. It does not help the gentleman to contradict the plain, unmistakeable passages of God's word.

But with reference to Luke xvi. 16, that presses him a little. He quotes it, and then stops a little short, scarcely half quoting it. He says, "the kingdom is preached," and

the latter part of it, "*every man presseth into it.*" Well, he don't like that dear friends. Now, I want the Dr. to tell me whether the Saviour was mistaken when he *said, men pressed into the kingdom?* If he did not mean that they were pressing into the kingdom at that time, his doctrine is a positive denial of the language of the Son of God.

Again, the Dr. says, we are not the true church, because we have not the right name! The Dr. did not tell us what the right name of the church is. *He did not tell us what the Bible name is.* He undoubtedly believes it was the "Christian church;" but, then, he has not given us any authority, in his meandering arguments, to show that the church was called the Christian church. The only authority that we have for the origin of that name with his church was less than fifty years ago. Certainly, *his* church was not named till a long time after the day of Pentecost! It is strange to me that a man would seriously make such an argument as that merely upon the name.

But, in regard to the proper foundation, he quotes from Mr. Orchard, where somebody says that the foundation, or the fundamental principle of these ancient Mennonites was the vital piety which was to be accepted by every member of the church. Where is the foundation, or vital piety? *Is it not the Son of God?* When the writer makes such an expression, we must not suppose he is denying that Christ was the foundation. Where is any vital piety outside of Christ, the foundation? It does seem strange to me that he refers to Dr. Wayland, that Baptists could arrange their own *rules and regulations!* Dr. Wayland meant that we are not dependent upon other denominations for our order, as we take it directly from God's word, having the *New Testament alone, neither more nor less, for our guide.* This is the testimony of Mr. Wayland upon this subject, and the attempt to force him into any other position is certainly very erroneous.

But, the Dr. says, we are not the true church, because the Baptists are called a sect. That word is perverted from its original meaning in the New Testment. It now applies to every denomination in the sense in which Webster uses it; and in the sense in which Webster uses it, Alexander Campbell calls his party a sect. Does that prove that they are not the kingdom of God upon earth? I believe I will read just what he says: "That such profession would make a new sect, or rather revive an old one."—Page 308, Mill. Harb., vol. 2. The Reformer would make a new sect, or revive an old one! Therefore, the gentleman's church can not be the true church of Christ, because Alexander Campbell called it a *sect!!* This is his own argument.

But, let me advance in review of his arguments. He says, we are wrong in our theory of conversion. But it is the universal practice in the gentleman's church, to take every member they can get from us, whether in good or bad standing! It is the universal practice, I say, and upon our theory of conversion too. They do not want them converted over again. They are good enough, and when any one goes from us to them, they are ready to take him. He referred to some of the members of his church, who come to us from the Disciples. I am reliably informed that *they professed conversion and regeneration independently of baptism.* I deny that it is the custom of the Baptist denomination to receive members from his church, unless they profess that they were pardoned, independent of immersion, not in the act of baptism. We do not do that, as charged. We usually immerse them, even when they profess conversion independent of the act of baptism. I never received one from his church in my life otherwise, and I have baptized quite a number. He certainly misunderstood us in regard to our practice. If this church has done otherwise, it is an exception; this is not regular, and ought not to be practiced. The statement which the gentleman has made, that we receive

members on their plan, is not practiced by the Baptists any where, and is only an exception that he finds when they are received without baptism.

But then, again, the Dr. says that *our theory of depravity is wrong!* If it is, dear friends, the Bible is wrong, it seems to me. We are not the church, because we teach the Bible doctrine that men are dead in trespasses and sins, without God in the world—without spiritual life. Mr. Campbell taught the same doctrine of total hereditary depravity. He did not use the word "total;" but he taught that in all their moral powers men had this original taint of depravity. And that is the ground we occupy. But the gentleman's picture of *total depravity* is not found in our works. The authority that the Dr. quoted is from the *Presbyterian Confession.* He has a little overdrawn their picture of total depravity. But he must not quote Presbyterian doctrine as applicable to the Baptist church! Our standard of depravity is that found in the word of God, *that man is totally destitute of spiritual life.* It is a condition of sin, and because of original sin. There is nothing wrong in our doctrine of depravity; because no man can be saved by his own powers. He can not open his own eyes, or his understanding. It is said that these must be opened by the Son of God, who came to open the eyes of the blind. Now, suppose you pour the light of day upon the blind's eyes—this is a very good illustration—you may increase that light fourfold, till it scourges the very eyeballs, and it will not give sight. So you may pour the light of God's word on one who is spiritually blind, who is carnally minded, who is at enmity against God, and it will only intensify that enmity, unless the Spirit of the living God should attend that word and open his heart. [TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' TENTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We have to read a little variety, in order to spice up matters. I referred to the fact that our brethren paid the gentleman five dollars a day, part of the time, because he spoke of having to wait for me at Blandinville. Well, he has read some letters, and I will read a paper, and then read a letter, and see what is stated.

"It is here proper to state that Dr. Lucas was too sick at the time the discussion was to have commenced according to the first arrangement, and some very strong insinuations were thrown out by some that the Dr. was afraid to come to time. Elder Ray's business was of such a pressing character that he thought he could not wait; and upon our brethren agreeing to pay him a consideration of $5 a day for his time, he concluded to await the Dr.'s coming."

That is the reference here in the paper, signed by John Houston, one of the most prominent and worthy men in that part of the country, whose word is his bond, and beyond suspicion. This is the character of the man that wrote this letter. Now I will read you another interesting document:

"BLANDINVILLE, ILL., March 21, 1873.

"BROTHER LUCAS—I have just received your letter, and perused its contents with interest. Elder Ray has wiggled precisely as I expected he would in reference to our paying him to stay. We bargained with Elder Delano, and paid to him five dollars per day for the space of four days, to induce

Elder Ray to remain here until you would be able to meet him in discussion. The arrangement had all the essentials of a contract. There was no misunderstanding in reference to any part. The consideration to be received, and the consideration to be paid, were well defined, and were both rendered. The only point that can come now in controversy is in regard to the authority of Elder Delano to make the contract. He himself told me some time previous that he was acting, so far as he would presume to act at all, as the mouthpiece of Elder Ray, and such was evidently my understanding of the situation when I made the bargain I have alluded to; otherwise I should have sought Elder Ray as the man with whom to deal. Now, was he then acting and did he act without the knowledge of Elder Ray? Did he swindle me to the tune of $20, instead of frankly telling me that he had no authority to act? A prominent Baptist hints to me this morning that the five dollars per day did not keep Elder Ray here—that he would have stayed anyhow. Then it follows that Elder Delano only pretended to permit me to hire his detention, and by so pretending extorted $20 from me to lighten his expenses. Very well, if agreeable to Elder Delano, so let the matter rest, so let it be understood in this community.

"And now let me give you a few facts, facts that can be sworn to if necessary, by men in this town. First, when the proposition to pay Elder Ray $5 a day to remain was made to Elder Delano by one of our brethren, who had consulted with me, Elder Delano refused to contract until he should have obtained the consent of Elder Ray. Second, Elder Delano and Elder Ray came together to the same place to consult further with my brethren in reference to some propositions, and Elder Ray refused to consider the subject until the offer should be made in writing by me. I then sent him the written offer through Elder Delano by the hand of a brother. Comment is unnecessary."*

* "*No such 'contract' was made. Bro. Ray remained at the request of the congregation. I pity the cause that can stoop to such means of support.*"—J. H. DELANO.

So, that is the statement of a man that stands as high as any man in the State of Illinois for morality, for piety, and for truth.

We will call your attention now to a statement or two in this work, lest I forget it, and then I wish to present another argument, as this is the last speech that I can introduce anything new, unless it be in reply to my friend, for I wish to get some other points before your minds. I stated that Mr. Smith was the head and founder of the General Baptist church, and now I give you the authority for that statement, p. 189: "The General Baptists maintain the doctrine of general redemption and the other points of the Armenian system; and are agreed with the Particular Baptists only on the subject of baptism, worship, and church discipline. The founder of this denomination is said to have been a Mr. Smith, an Episcopal clergyman, who, resigning his living in the church, went to Holland, where his principles were warmly opposed by Ainsworth and Robinson." Here it is affirmed that this Mr. Smith was the founder of the Baptist church. Now, with regard to the argument that we offer. We state, as the eighth argument, that their theory of the final perseverance of the saints is opposed to the teachings of the word of God, and consequently they can not be the church of Christ. This is, with the other characteristics, an argument we have offered against the gentleman's proposition being true. Now, they aver that when a man is once converted and brought into the church that there is no possibility of his falling away. We state, with that theory that there are many passages of Scriptures that can not be reconciled with this theory of the gentleman's church. We cite you to a few passages, and only to a few out of the many that might be quoted. In Hebrews iv. 9, we have it stated: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God."

In the 11th verse of the same chapter, Paul says:

"Labor, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief;" referring to the departure of the Israelites from the service of God. "Labor, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man fall," is the reason assigned here by the apostle. We undertake to say, there can be no force, there can be no point, there can be no propriety in the exhortation of the apostle here, unless it is possible for a man to fall away and finally fail to enjoy that crown offered to those that persevere in the service of God to the end. We have not only this declaration, but in 2d Peter, 1st chapter, beginning with the 5th verse, we have these words: "Add to your faith virtue." He speaks of the persons referred to in the previous part of the chapter, where the apostle says to them that "Ye have obtained a like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." And now, he says, "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." Now, what? Why, "if you do these things, you shall never fall." I ask, what is the converse proposition? If you do not these things, you shall fall. But if you do these things, you shall not be barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Now, the apostle says, wherefore the rather brethren give diligence to make your calling and election sure. Your election is not sure yet, and he exhorts them to make their calling and election sure by cultivating those virtues in their lives to which the apostle here refers. Then this passage, we say, teaches that if we fail to attend to the instructions of the apostle here that we will fall; while, on the other hand, if we do these things we shall never fall. Then we find in Ezekiel xviii. 24, this language:

"When I say to the righteous man he shall surely live, yet if he turn away from his righteousness or doeth or committeth iniquity, shall he live? He shall not surely live, he shall surely die."

When God says to the righteous man, if you commit iniquity—turn from your righteousness and commit iniquity—you shall not live, you shall surely die, I ask you, can language be plainer than this? Certainly, my dear friends, there is no language that can be plainer with regard to the matter and the points we have now before us. I will turn to the passage and read you the whole verse to which we have referred, just as it is presented in the book itself:

"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, *and* doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked *man* doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die."

Here then, you discover that a man may fall away and he shall die, he shall not live. He forfeits his right to live, by going away from righteousness, and commit iniquity. But we call your minds to 1st Corinthians, 9th chapter, and 27th verse. Here we have the language of Paul: "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself, should be a castaway." I ask you, upon what principle can this language be explained? Can this language be explained, unless it be upon the principle that there is a possibility of a man being converted, and in the kingdom, and yet becoming a castaway? That Paul was converted, no one will deny. That Paul was in the kingdom, no one will deny. And yet he taught, that it was necessary to keep his body under subjection, that lest after he had preached to others, that he himself should become a castaway; showing with all clearness that there is a possi-

bility of falling, and of being castaway, and forfeiting our right to the enjoyment of that blessedness, and of that glorious honor that is in reservation for those who run to the end of the race. We call your minds to one other passage, and we shall read in your hearing the 19th verse of the 22d chapter of Revelations: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." I ask this question, has any one a part in the book of life who has not his name written in the book of life? Have any their names written in the book of life who have not been converted, and adopted into his family, or become his children? I presume no one will answer in the negative. No one will say that the individual has his name written in the book of life, unless he is converted. We agree as to this point, that he must be converted, and become a child of God, to have his name written there in the book of life. Now, it is said, the man that takes away from the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and *from* the things which are written in this book. From the fact that his name is taken out of the book of life, and his part is taken out of the holy city, is evidence that he had become a convert of God, that his name was in that book, and that he had a part in that city, and failing to persevere in the service, he lost his right to these blessings and to his birthright. It is affirmed by Paul, in the 6th chapter of the Hebrews, that the individual, though he may have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and though he may have been made a partaker of the Holy Spirit, yet, if he fall away, the apostle affirms that it is impossible to renew such a one to repentance. Here, then, you discover that Paul talks about a man falling away, who has tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and has been made a partaker of the Holy Spirit. Yet Paul

talks about that very individual falling away. Then, we say, the gentleman's church is wrong upon this point, and that it fails in this particular to possess the characteristics of the true church of Christ. The last argument that we present is this, that eternal life is suspended upon faithfulness. The apostles always taught the disciples to add to their faith, to fight the good fight of faith, that they might lay hold upon eternal life. This is the instruction and exhortation given them, in order to induce them to go forward, in order to enjoy the blessing, that there was a condition presented upon which all these eternal blessings were suspended, and that only by observing the conditions can we enjoy those eternal honors and favors. The gentleman fails, then, to instruct according to the primitive teachings, and to present these motives to induce obedience; for he says, that converted they will enjoy this blessedness whether they persevere or not, that perseverance is not necessary, that faithfulness is not necessary if they have properly been converted to God, in order to enjoy the blessings of the eternal life, for they can not fall away, and that they will enjoy these blessings, though they may fail to persevere. Having now presented this argument, we desire your attention to some points presented by the gentleman in his address.

He reads from Romans, to show that it is by faith that we are justified without obedience to God; and he tells you that we have taken the position that it was by works of righteousness in connection with it. So far as works of righteousness, as presented by Paul, are concerned, we take no such position; but we do say, in the language of Paul, that when those Romans obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine, they were then made free from sin, they become the servants of righteousness, and all who thus are made free from sin become the servants of righteousness, and have their fruit unto holiness, and in the end everlasting life. John says: "He who doeth righteousness

is righteous, even as he is righteous," and he says, "Little children, let no man deceive you by preaching something else." "He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." If the gentleman wishes to form an issue with the apostle, then let him form that issue and not tell just what John has affirmed. With regard to his quotation from the apostle Paul referring to the question of justification by faith being imputed for righteousness, Paul discussed the same subject that James presents to our view, the faith of Abraham, where it is affirmed that Abraham's faith was imputed unto him for righteousness. Let us see what James says on that same subject. We find in the 2d chapter of James, commencing with the 20th verse: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled"—now, mark, "and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God."

Then you discover that the Scripture, with regard to Abraham, as presented by Paul and James, refers to the very same case; they quote the same language, and say the Scriptures are fulfilled, when Abraham offered his son Isaac upon the altar, that this Scripture was fulfilled which saith: "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." James told the truth, and that he refers to the same thing that Paul referred to is clear, from the fact that he mentions the very same declaration. My friend has told us that his church is in the wilderness. Well, we will simply deny it. The gentleman's church never was in the wilderness here referred to. It may have been in the wilderness, away back in Judea, the wilderness of Judea; it may have been there, and my candid impression is, that while the gentleman

goes away back there to find his establishment, in the wilderness of Judea, my impression is, that it never has passed out of that wilderness, but that it is there yet, and is not likely to ever get out.

My friend speaks of succession again. He holds to the subject with a firm, determined grasp. Succession again, and he calls upon Benedict and Robinson, and other Baptist authorities, to prove his proposition. We have quoted in your hearing the language of Benedict, where he says: "We base no claim at all upon an unbroken line of succession; we do not found our claim as a church upon this succession;" and not only so, but he quotes from Robinson—one of the gentleman's own historians, and one of the gentleman's witnesses—where Robinson says—and Benedict indorses the statement—where he says, that a church needs not this unbroken succession. We quote not now precisely his language, as it has been before you so often, and you recollect the point presented: "No church, except a church founded upon tradition, and not upon the word of God, needs the succession referred to, this unbroken line and chain of succession"—that church founded upon superstition needs the succession, but not the church founded upon the word of God, the immutable truth, and undying truth of the word of God. And, also, this Encyclopedia, as we have quoted time and again, affirms the same thing.—[TIME EXPIRED.]

ELDER RAY'S LAST ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I stand before you in my closing speech on this proposition. As regards the letter and paper read by my friend, I will simply state that, to my mind, it is just a little development of the doctrine of *total depravity* that men rely upon sometimes when they fail to meet argument as they should. The statement in the last part of that letter, that I employed Brother Delano to make a contract with the Disciples, is certainly untrue. *There is not a word of truth in it.* I protested against his receiving anything from those people, because I knew they wished to get some sort of a handle against *D. B. Ray.* The voice of a great congregation voted that I should stay at Blandinville, and give them opportunity of hearing the discussion. *I stayed there because I believed the cause of Christ demanded it.* These were the motives that prompted me. There is no necessity, in this discussion, of impugning my motives.

But, a word in regard to our communion. I will state, that it is ever recognized as the right of each congregation to attend to its own discipline. As my worthy friend, and Brother Cook, has said, the membership of this church can not go and call a pastor to another church, or complain if they are not allowed to do it. For instance, in London, where there are 140 Baptist churches, I believe, and about 40 in Philadelphia, suppose they were to invite everybody who claimed to be Baptists; then those excluded from fellowship might commune, and even the most abandoned could come, that do

not belong to any church. This would be the result, because they are not acquainted with everybody, and whether they are or not, it is right that the churches preserve the purity of their fellowship. It is proper that they do that which is in accordance with the practices of the apostles and the word of the living God. But I have not time to devote to that question now, as I must proceed with my recapitulation. Before doing so, I must notice a very few statements my friend has made in regard to the Baptists—his objections to the Baptists, as mentioned in his last speech. He says that he had remarked that Mr. John Smith, or Mr. Smith—I don't believe he said *John* Smith, but I suppose that is the gentleman he was trying to talk about. He affirmed that Smith was the founder and father of the *General* Baptists. This is the first time he said so. Dr., you said that he was the founder of the *Regular* Baptists the other time. It seems that you are so badly posted concerning Baptist affairs, that you have mixed things up. I will state that John Smith, like Roger Williams, was said to have been baptized by one of his brethren. He was not baptized in England at all. This fact is necessary to be noticed: that, as I have already proved, *the English Baptists did not receive their baptism from John Smith*, and yet the charge is made. It is true that there are those that have been called *General* and *Particular* Baptists in England, and some of these General Baptists—they do not differ in church organization—have gone off "into mixed communion," as it is called, under the influence and leadership of Robert Hall. *Smith was not their founder.*

The Baptist denomination in America received their direct line of succession from the Particular Baptists in England. The phrase *Particular Baptists*—the gentleman has been misled in the use of the term. When you leave those out, that are called *Seventh-Day* Baptists, who are mostly in the East, and have no connection with us, we have then the great Baptist

denomination. And it does seem strange that the gentleman, in discussing with one who belongs to a church of larger adult membership than any, I will say, upon the continent of America, should affect ignorance as to which denomination I belong. I trust that by this time he has had a little more light upon that subject. But he said he could not tell at the beginning of the discussion! He says our theory is wrong about the perseverance of the saints, because we do not teach that some of God's people may go down to the dark world of hell —we are not the church of Christ!

I have no time to mention all the objections. In a former discussion he seemed to make a point that because I did not answer all the objections individually, but did it under one argument, that I could not do so. And now, if I do not mention all, forsooth, he will say, I can not answer his arguments!

But I believe God's word is true, when he says, "whosoever believeth in him hath eternal life," and if he can prove that everlasting, eternal life means only a few days, then he gets apostasy; and if he can not prove this, *apostasy* goes by the board, and his interpretations of these passages are not true. But I will turn to one, if I have time, just a moment, to allude to it, where Paul says, If they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again under repentance. This proves, to my friend, that there are some that do fall away! But don't you know the gentleman said, "*if*" he had the money, he could buy the *rolling mills.* There is the 'if' there. *If they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance.* The doctrine of his church I understand to be a restoration after they fall away. And then, after they get out from the church, they are children of Satan.

Paul says: *If they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew to repentance,* but according to the practice of his church, even when they go out of the church, and become children of Satan, they may come again a second time, and be taken in

without baptism! It takes at first baptism to save them, but when they become apostate sinners, who can not be received to repentance, they can get salvation without baptism! This is one of the absurdities his church gets him into. I asked him about it in a former discussion, but he didn't answer the question. Well, he said, if a member of the church erred, he ought to be restored. My friend was talking about a member of the church; I asked about one who had been baptized, and afterward became a child of Satan. But his church will restore this apostate child of Satan without baptism! I had asked, and ask again, if baptism is essential to pardon, and apostasy is true, how are you going to restore without baptism any, "if they shall fall away?"

Paul's argument in the 15th ch. 1st Cor., where he says: "If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised." Now, according to the gentleman's argument, it may be contended that the resurrection is not true, because there are at least half a dozen "ifs" in regard to the resurrection!

Concerning the resurrection, Paul argued geometrically. He stated his position hypothetically, and drew the absurd conclusion, in order to establish the truth of the proposition. And so in Heb. vi. 6: "If they shall fall," there is no more repentance. Because there would be no more repentance if one should fall, is Paul's argument against falling. This agrees with his statement in the 17th verse of the same chapter, "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath: That by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Here is the *eternal counsel* of God, and *oath*, that the Christian's hope *is sure and steadfast.* These two *immu-*

table things, God's *counsel and oath*, must be changed before one of His children is lost. I believe that it would be as easy to seize the throne of the eternal God, and hurl it into confusion, as to destroy one of God's "elect." I mean the true believer in Christ, who has been made so "through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth." "If it were possible," says Jesus, "they, false teachers deceive the very elect." I thank God for his promise of salvation. It would be but little *consolation* to me to know that after all my toils, and trials, and sorrows, that I have a Saviour that will not save to the uttermost. No, brethren, it is *a hope, sure and steadfast, that enters to that within the veil.*

But the righteous man turning away from righteousness (Ezekiel xviii. 24)—referring to his own overt acts of righteousness, when he turns away; it only develops that fact, that his heart is corrupt, that he is not a child of God. Men are addressed according to the profession. This passage does not refer to the condition of the heart, but simply refers to man's actions. A man turns away from his own righteousness—righteous acts. You know a man may for awhile be righteous in his acts without being a child of God. Paul supposes that he might *bestow all his goods to feed the poor, and give his body to be burned, and have not charity*, and when he turns away in his acts, he develops his want of righteousness in his heart.

Now, my friend misrepresented us. We do not say that it makes no difference what we do, we will be saved anyhow.

He never heard a Baptist say that—never. *We are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works."*

The passage in Revelations—I must mention it, and if I go a few minutes over, you can give my friend the same time. "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city." Now, what part has such an one there? Why, he has a professional part—a claim;

that is all. The Saviour called Judas a *friend* as he came to betray him. He was not a friend in heart, neither was he converted. *He was a professed friend.* Though there is none righteous, no, not one, Jesus said that "there is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." I illustrate it this way. There is an estate that is to be inherited, and there are quite a number of heirs, that put in a claim to the inheritance. They all have a part in the estate, at least professedly. The difficulty comes before the court, and it is decided that one man's claim is not lawful. His part is taken out. That is the way, I understand, when the time comes for the secrets of all hearts to be revealed, the man that takes from God's word, *his part is taken out of the book of life and the city of God.*

I must believe the Bible, that says: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he can not sin, because he is born of God." Sin has no more dominion in the soul. It is the spirit which is born of the spirit. The sin that is committed afterward originates through the unrenewed nature—the carnal man. Paul explains it in Rom. vii. The gentleman has said that our theory of repentance is wrong, and our theory of communion is wrong. I wish to read what Alexander Campbell says. I intended to read it before, but the book had fallen off the desk. He says, in the Christian System, p. 122: "THE BELIEF OF ONE FACT, *and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is required, as far as faith goes to salvation. The belief of this* ONE FACT, *and submission to* ONE INSTITUTION *expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church.*"

Again, p. 122, Christian System: "Every such person is a disciple in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution; and whether he

believes the five points condemned, or the five points approved by the Synod of Dort, is not so much as asked of him; whether he holds any of the views of the Calvinists, or Arminians, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, or Quakers, is never once to be asked of such persons, in order to admission into that Christian community, called the church." All the gentleman's arguments against us have been foreign from the subject, according to Mr. Campbell himself. He contends that men may hold all these different views, whether Quakers or Methodists in their views, or whether they hold the five points approved or the five points condemned by the Synod of Dort, it don't matter as regards entering the church. My friend's own church does not believe in the validity of his arguments. He has not made an argument against Baptists that is sound with his own people.

But to the recapitulation. I have shown, dear friends, that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics which entitle them to be regarded as the visible church or kingdom of Jesus Christ. We do not mean by this that all the Christians in the world believe with us. We believe that a man ought to be a child of God, an heir of heaven, before he is authorized to unite with the church of the living God. We believe that there are other sheep which are not of this fold, and that God will finally bring them in, and ultimately there will be but *one Shepherd and one fold.* We believe that there are some among the nations saved that do not compose a part of that great city that symbolizes the church. We believe that there are those who will be at the marriage of the Lamb, that form no part of the organized bride, the Lamb's wife. We regard these as wonderful and glorious truths revealed in God's precious word.

First. I have shown that there is a *succession* of the church of the living God. I appealed to Daniel, that the kingdom set up by the God of heaven *shall stand forever; that it should*

never be destroyed. I appealed to Daniel vii. 27, *that it was an everlasting kingdom.* I have shown from the words of Jesus, *that the gates of hell should not prevail against it;* and from the angel, *that of His kingdom there shall be no end;* and from Paul, *that it was a kingdom not to be moved.* Thus, then, I have demonstrated *that a succession of the church must exist somewhere.* Whether we can trace it by uninspired history or not, *that succession does exist.* And I have shown that it can not belong to the Romish church, which is the great Babylonish Antichrist; and I have shown there is no other party to put in a claim except the Baptists, outside of the church of Rome; and therefore the succession simply falls to us by inheritance. I have shown that the Baptists are the church of the living God, if there is one that has the succession. And I have shown from the testimony of the leading men of the gentleman's church that the succession does exist. Mr. Lard says there is a succession, and he also denies the gentleman's criticism about the rock. I have given you the testimony of Mr. Lipscomb, one of his prominent men in Tennessee, who contends for that succession. Also, Tolbert Fanning says, *that the church of the living God has outrode the rough waves of eighteen centuries.* So Ben. Franklin testifies; so all these mighty men of his church testify that that church has stood all the time. Alexander Campbell contended for the perpetuity of the church; and more than that, *that the Baptists possessed that kingdom until his Reformation.* Mr. Campbell was the founder of the gentleman's church, a great man, who has passed away. He said that the Baptists could trace their principles and practices in every essential particular in a direct line up to the apostolic age, as shown in this discussion. And Mr. Campbell has said of these ancient witnesses, that it does not matter about the name, whether they were called Novatians, Waldenses, or by any other nickname, but that they were members of the church of the living God. I have shown

that the *Baptists* claim this succession, and although a great many do not think it very important to trace it out from the historic standpoint, *yet they stand united that the succession exists.* Also, it is proved from God's word, and from ecclesiastical history outside of the Bible. I have shown that no church originating since the time of Christ and his apostles upon earth can possibly be the original church of Christ. Therefore we have the right to that claim, because we have the succession.

But at this point I wish attention to the testimony of two of the most learned historians in the kingdom of Holland, Ypeij and Dermout, appointed to write the history of the *Dutch Reformed Church*, two learned Pedobaptists, who had access to all the archives and libraries of Germany. They affirm that the "*Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages.*" The gentleman tried to to make the impression that I quoted from Baptist authority in reference to this matter, when the truth is this quotation is found in the Religious Encyclopedia, from historians who are not Baptists, but who are as reliable men as ever lived. The gentleman said that I have not the historic statements to prove that the Baptists existed before the year 1552! And yet these learned historians say that such was the fact. And Mosheim has said the same that the Baptist church goes back up the stream of time, so far that their *origin is hid in the remote depths of antiquity.*

Second. We have shown from ample testimony, *that the Baptists possess the Bible characteristics of the church of Christ, from the fact that they have no founder or head other than Jesus Christ.* I have called in stentorian voice upon the gentleman to tell us,

if Jesus Christ did not found the church known as the Baptist church, who did? And he has not responded, and he will not, because he can not. On that point he is as silent as the grave. Again, *I ask who did found the Baptist church, if Jesus Christ did not?* Let a man ask me who founded any church that sets up a claim as being the church of Christ, and I will answer the question from a historic standpoint. I will bring forward the proof; I will not—like the gentleman—affirm thus and so, without bringing forward the proof.

In the third place, *I have shown that the Baptists were the martyr church through the dark ages.* I have shown that the members of that church suffered when all the rest of the "Christian" world were symbolizing with Rome. They suffered long before the time of Luther and Calvin, for the cause of Christ and for his kingdom, and hundreds of thousands, yes millions, of our denomination have died for the truth that we advocate, while storm after storm of persecution swept over the church of the living God. But that church was founded upon *the rock*, and it has stood against all attempts that have been made to destroy it. And the gentleman's arguments, introduced on this occasion, and brought to bear upon the proposition, will not move this church of the living God that has stood so long. All his logic and power will not affect it! It has stood the storms of ages, and it will stand through all coming time. I have shown the history of this church, step by step, and I wish it written in large capitals in the book, THAT THE GENTLEMAN HAS NOT CALLED IN QUESTION THE AUTHORITIES THAT I HAVE INTRODUCED. *I have introduced quotation after quotation, both from his church and outside, which he has not called in question.* I have shown that the Baptist church is the martyr church, that it is on the foundation of "the apostles and the prophets—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" we acknowledge no other doctrine than that of Christ and his apostles.

I have quoted from the authorities, to prove that the Baptist church has the right foundation. *Other foundation can no man lay than Jesus Christ.*

Fifth. I have shown that it receives the proper materials. None but those who are God's *true* children, born again, those who profess to be God's children, having repented of sins, and believed in Jesus Christ, have the right to membership in the church of God. How have these arguments been answered? The Dr. has attempted to answer some, and some he has passed by in silence. My first argument, if he answered it, I don't remember it at all. I don't think he attempted to reply to the first argument. And the *second*, in regard to the historic line of succession, his answer has simply been a few denials. The quotations made from Benedict, and the Encyclopedia, show that we do not claim it is necessary to trace the succession, in order to regulate our faith and practice; and yet these same writers affirm that the *succession does exist*, and must exist.

Sixth. We have the Bible characteristic in reference to the order: *repentance, faith, the burial in baptism, and the Lord's table in the Lord's kingdom*, as established by the Son of God himself. How has he answered these arguments? Some of them he has not mentioned, especially where Jesus says, "ye repented not afterward that ye might believe him." Has he dared to touch that? No, he has not. Our Saviour makes repentance *in order to* faith; repentance, faith and baptism is the divine order. The apostle said that he testified to the Jews and Greeks *repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* And yet the gentleman attempts to argue that we are not the church of Christ, simply because we follow the direction and example of Jesus, and the preaching of Paul. And I called attention to the order of the three witnesses: *the Spirit, the water, and the blood.* The Dr. has failed to mention these witnesses, or to show that they

do not testify in the proper order. The examples he referred to are not in point. John iii. 5, "born of water and the spirit." He assumed that *born of water* means baptism, which it does not; for "that which is born of the spirit, is spirit," but if it was baptism, it would be the flesh born again!

Seventh. I pass to another characteristic. We hold the true church government—the Bible alone, as our only rule of faith and practice. He has called this in question.

Eighth. But we have shown that the Baptist church has passed through the wilderness of obscurity, which is a characteristic of the true church. The gentleman has attempted to make a little play in regard to this obscurity, and he thinks that they are in the wilderness yet. But, brethren, there was a time when the church of the living God, symbolized by woman, had the wings of a great eagle given to her, and she did fly from the face of the old dragon, the serpent, that cast out of its mouth a flood of water to destroy the church of the living God. But the church was preserved from the face of the dragon for 1260 long years—1260 prophetic days. She testified in sackcloth as the church of the living God. And this brings us down to the times of the Reformation, and from this time we have the record through Mosheim and others, that the Baptists, as the members of the true church, did appear in several countries at the same time; and according to Mosheim, it was difficult to tell where they did originate! As soon as the persecutions were partly removed, they came out of the wilderness, and were made manifest to the world, as before they had been hid in the wilderness. It is true that we have some glimpses of the wilderness history —footprints of the bride in the desert.

We have the evidences of the persecutions she endured, preserved by Papist councils and otherwise. She was in the wilderness of obscurity, suffering for the cause of Christ—not in the wilderness in the sense of apostasy into false

doctrine, but in the wilderness of obscurity, where she preserved her purity as the church of the living God. And, dear brethren, I love to contemplate that prophetic song of Solomon, that describes the bride—that church in the wilderness—in which the bridegroom is made to say: "O, my dove, *thou art* in the clefts of the rock, in the secret *places* of the stairs, let me see thy countenance, let me hear thy voice; for sweet *is* thy voice, and thy countenance is comely." Then, again, "Who is she *that* looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, *and* terrible as *an army* with banners?" "Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness, leaning upon her beloved?" We believe it is the persecuted bride of the Lamb, the church of the living God. I thank God for that prophetic description of the marriage of the Lamb at last.

I know that my time has nearly expired, and I desire in conclusion, to thank the congregation for their patient attention, while I enjoyed the privilege that I have had for presenting the claims of that church, that is now called the *Baptist Church*; a church whose founder and head, the gentleman can not find this side of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The marriage of the Lamb is yet to come. I often think of the marriage song that is mentioned in Rev. xix: Whose volume will come like the voice of seven-fold thunders, saying, alleluia for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. Or, as it reads thus: "And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." And then that glorious period will have come, when the holy city will be seen descending from God out of heaven, having been caught up to meet the bridegroom who is coming; and

then there will be no more curse, no more sin, or death, when we will see eye to eye, and speak the same things, and there will be none to molest or make us afraid in all the holy mountain of God.—[TIME EXPIRED.]

DR. LUCAS' LAST REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Before I proceed, I will simply turn to the reference that my friend made to the subject of depravity. Referring to Mr. Goodnight and Mr. Houston, I am certain that those gentlemen can weigh, morally, with my friend, or any one else in this house. That question is fully understood by every one who knows those gentlemen. They stand without reproach, and beyond suspicion. That is all I have to say now upon that subject, and the question of total depravity may be as clearly made out with regard to my friend as with regard to these individuals. I trust I will have the attention of the audience, as this is the close of the discussion, until I get through. Before I proceed to notice the claim that my friend has tried to make, and that is necessary to be made, I call your minds again to the language of Mosheim, found on page 500, where he speaks of the Particular Baptists and the General Baptists. My friend claims the succession through the Particular Baptists, not through the General Baptists. Hear what Mosheim says upon this subject. Speaking of the General Baptists: "Now, they agree with the Particular Baptists in this circumstance, that they admit to baptism adult persons only, and administer that sacrament by dipping or total immersion; but they differ from them in another respect, that is, in repeating the administration of baptism to those who have received it either in a state of infancy or by aspersion instead of dipping, for, if the common account may be believed, the Particular Baptists do not carry matters so far."

Here is one of the links through which the gentleman proposes to trace his church. Mosheim, whom my friend has introduced a number of times, is a reliable historian. He says I have not impeached his authorities. I have not. I believe that Mosheim is a good historian. He says the Particular Baptists were not like the General Baptists in this particular, they do not baptize over again those who have been baptized in infancy, and they do not rebaptize those who have been baptized by aspersion. That is the testimony of Mosheim with regard to the Particular Baptists, one of the links through which the gentleman proposes to trace his church. We stated in the beginning, that in order to fix his succession he must show as he passed through the Mennonites, Anabaptists and Waldenses; that while the Baptist church was divided into at least ten different families or denominations, the church of Christ is not a denomination—as the Baptists are divided into branches. We have shown that he must select his member of that family. He must select from the Mennonites. He must show that the Baptist family with which he sustains connection possesses precisely the characteristics of the family or branch of the Mennonites that he selects—that they are identical. Then, when he comes to the Anabaptists, he must show that the Mennonites, through whom he traces his succession, are the particular family of the Anabaptists that he selects—are identical. Then he must take the same position in reference to the Waldenses, for, according to the history of the Waldenses, they practiced infant baptism. And we find that the Mennonites practiced aspersion. Hence the necessity of his selecting his particular member of these families. Then he must show that the Waldensian family that he selects is identical with the family selected among the Anabaptists; and so on, back to the commencement of the church of Jesus Christ. And then he must show that the last link is identical with the church of Christ. He must do this, or his suc-

cession fails. He must do this in order to prove the identity, and we both agree that identity is what is wanted. Then, he has failed to do this, and, indeed, he has made no effort to show that these different links hold the same doctrines as the Baptist church, and to-day he has not shown it, and I presume, for one of the very best reasons, that he knew it was utterly impossible for him to show the identity of these different links with these different families through which he proposes to trace his church. If he had the evidence, I am very certain he would not have failed to produce it; but as it is, the entire result is only a grand failure. You have heard all that he has had to say upon the question, and we venture the assertion that you will bear testimony that he has not even tried, in these different links of what he calls his chain, to show identity with them. The truth is, the chain is a very short one, composed of only one link, and that the Baptist church to which he belongs. That is the length of his chain—that is all there is of it that he has proved. Nothing more.

But in regard to some points presented in the gentleman's last address. He has told us again that the Baptist church was the martyr church. The argument that he proposes to make is this: That the Baptist church being the martyr church, therefore it must be the church of Christ. That is his argument. Now, I ask you to recollect your historical knowledge, and see if I do not state what your own judgment tells you is right. The Episcopal church is a martyr church. They have had their martyrs by hundreds and thousands, and therefore the Episcopal church is the church of Christ. Now, that is the argument, and we have two churches of Christ. The Presbyterian church is a martyr church, therefore the Presbyterian church is the church of Christ. We have three. The Quakers, as a body, was a martyr church, therefore they are the church of Christ. Now we have four. We might go on, and name others. Instead of the gentleman's argument

proving that the Baptist church is the church of Christ, he proves that we simply have four, or half a dozen at least, churches of Christ. The gentleman does not believe a word of that; but it is a principle of logic that he who proves too much, proves nothing. The gentleman's argument proves more than he wanted to prove, therefore it proves nothing, because there is just as much in favor of one martyr church as there is in favor of another. It proves nothing on the subject.

My friend has stated time and again that we have not proved thus and so. We have denied, we have said thus and so, but we have not proved it. Well, the gentleman has been on the proving side this time, and I think this audience will bear testimony that we have proved a great deal. But the gentleman says, thus and so, I affirm that this is true, or, I get up and deny, as I am on the negative side. When he comes up before this people and says, "Now for your proof that it is not so." He has asserted that Jesus Christ is the head of the Baptist church. I have denied it. Has he proved it? He comes up and tells the audience I ought to prove that Jesus Christ is not the head of the Baptist church, and then he ought to tell who is the head of the Baptist church. What does it concern me who is its head, if Jesus Christ is not its head? I ask him what does it concern me if the gentleman fails to show that Jesus Christ is the head of the Baptist church. I have denied it, and I ask, does it look like a strong debater, or a man that feels confidence in his position, to stand up here and say, "Now, then, if Jesus Christ is not the head of it, then I want you to prove that somebody else is." The gentleman has been on the proving side on this proposition, and he has been placed under the necessity of proving what he asserts. The rules of discussion would not require me to prove a single thing, but simply to show that his witnesses do not prove what he affirms they do. I think I

have shown this in this discussion. The gentlemen then, instead of proving this proposition, goes back to the old proposition. I have been satisfied all the time that he was not satisfied with the effort that he made under that proposition, and consequently he has been going back constantly, and saying the Dr. said so and so, and this and that, under the form of the discussion of the proposition, that we first had in their debate, showing clearly that he was not satisfied with the discussion, upon that proposition. He could get along a great deal better, and run back there, and talking about this and that, rather than in trying to prove his proposition. We are perfectly satisfied with the discussion that we have made on our affirmation, and we are willing that it shall go to the world just that way. The arguments we offered we believe to be conclusive, and we are willing to abide the decision of the community. Do you recollect the reply that my friend made in regard to the argument on perseverance? He gets up and says that the gentleman objects to it. Why? because he says the children of God will not be lost. The true issue then is, that there is a possibility of falling away from grace, and that it is necessary to persevere in order to keep from falling away. Then he says that in these passages, that the inspired teacher when God speaks to persons as though they were so and so, and occupied a certain condition, when really they do not.

I wonder if Paul is one of that class. Paul says, "I keep my body under subjection, lest after I have preached to others I myself might become a castaway." If there was no other passage than this one, it alone sets aside the gentleman's doctrine. For there is no other meaning in Paul's language than that there is a possibility of being a castaway, being deprived of the enjoyment of the blessing of eternal life.

But we must look to our review. I want to know how much the gentleman passed over the regular time?

Mr. Glover (one of the Moderators)—You have now about fifteen minutes.

Dr. Lucas—I come then to the argument offered against the gentleman's proposition. The gentleman has affirmed that his church was established in the days of John the Baptist, during the personal ministry of Christ, and then when he was pressed upon that point with regard to certain passages, he says the apostles were not called until after John was in prison, and Jesus never gave the kingdom to the apostles until he went away. That count brings us forty days this side of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Forty days after his resurrection he ascended to the Father, and consequently, according to his own admission, the church was not established in the days of John. Again, we called attention to certain passages in regard to this matter; one, where the disciples expected the kingdom immediately to appear, showing that it had not appeared. We call attention to the language of Jesus, as found in Matthew xvi. 18: Upon this rock I *will* build my church. Here, then, it is affirmed as still future, and Jesus went away to receive his kingdom. He went away forty days after his resurrection to receive his kingdom, showing that he had not yet received his kingdom. Many other passages we quoted upon this subject that we have not now time to repeat. But these show the kingdom at that time as future, and that the kingdom was fully set up in the days of John the Baptist, but was prospective. The second argument that we offered was this: that the gentleman was wrong in regard to its name, that he had not the scriptural name for his church. There is but one being in the Bible that ever has been called Baptist, and that was John the harbinger of Jesus.

Thirdly, we have shown that they are not built on the true foundation. He says, his church was built before the death of Christ, and during his personal ministry. We have shown that Jesus entered not into the foundation until he

became the tried stone; that he was tried by his suffering, the temptation of Satan, and his death upon the cross; therefore he could not be the foundation, the tried stone, before that time; that after he was tried, the builders rejected him, and he became the head of the corner. And also in Ephesians—I quoted the passage, showing that the church was not built upon that foundation until after the middle wall of partition was taken away by Jesus nailing it to his cross. Bringing us this side of the time when the gentleman says his church was built. He is wrong, fourthly, in regard to man's moral nature, teaching that he is totally depraved. He objected to our reading from the Westminster Confession; but, then, we take the words, "total," just as they are, and, I ask you, what is the idea conveyed? total, entire, universal depravity, corruption. I ask you, then, if this corruption is entire and universal, is not the very idea, depraved totally, in every faculty of his soul, and every member of his body, embodied and embraced in the term, a total depravity? That is just precisely what we quoted. He is wrong here, because the Bible teaches that man can come to the Saviour. The reason why he does not live is, because he will not come, not because he can not. He will not come, is the language of the word of God. Fifthly, his theory of conversion is wrong, and must of necessity be so, from their doctrine and theory of man's moral nature. Mr. Williams, as we have quoted, and the gentleman has not denied it, affirms, upon the ground that man is the subject of total depravity, that in order to his conversion there must be a supernatural operation of the Spirit of God. In answer to this, we say, that such an operation would bring into existence as great a miracle as ever has been performed or recorded in history, since the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy. He is wrong in his theory of conversion, as a supernatural operation of the Spirit of God, and wrong in regard to his faith alone. We have

shown you that it is not faith alone; that faith alone is dead. That obedience in connection with faith is necessary in order to the remission of sins. "God be thanked, though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to you, being then made free from sin." Obedience is necessary, then, as well as faith, in order to the remission of sins. I have shown you that the gentleman's theology is wrong in regard to the relation that faith sustains to repentance. I have called your attention to the office of faith upon the human heart, that by faith the heart is purified, and as the result, godly sorrow is excited in the heart, as the result of the office of faith upon the heart, and this godly sorrow being wrought in the heart, works repentance that needs not to be repented of. That repentance is the result, therefore, of the office of faith upon the heart exhibited in the life, wrought by this godly sorrow, and this godly sorrow is the result of faith.

We have shown you that Dr. Lynd indorses precisely our position here, when he affirms that he who truly believes will repent. We have shown you that Mr. Jeter indorses our position, when he states that faith is the commencement of spiritual life and the source of all true obedience; and if it be the commencement of the spiritual life, if repentance is essential to spiritual life, then is it the commencement of repentance; and if repentance is a part of true obedience, and faith is the source of all true obedience, then is faith the source of repentance, and, consequently, being its source, it must be before repentance. It must in the very nature of things exist before. And not only so, but the sixth argument was in regard to the knowledge of pardon. The gentleman is wrong upon that. We say the feeling of this one, and that one, and the other,—each has the same evidence; showing clearly that the gentleman's witnesses are not reliable.

But, seventh, the practice and observance of the Lord's

Supper are inconsistent and unscriptural in those that he admits as the children of God. Paul says to the children of God, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat;" but my friend says, no, we will examine you, and say to you, no, sir, you shall not eat. That is the practice of the gentleman's church.

And, eighthly, we remarked that the gentleman is wrong, and his church is wrong, in regard to final perseverance. If the Scriptures teach anything at all, they teach that the man may fall away. Hence the common exhortation to go forward in the duties that Christianity imposes.

And now, in conclusion, we ask you in all candor to think seriously while it is called to-day. Can you conclude that that church, wrong in its commencement, wrong in its name, wrong in its foundation, wrong in its theory of man's moral nature, wrong in its conversion, wrong in its theory in regard to the plan by which we obtain a knowledge of the pardon of sin, wrong on the subject of the Lord's Supper, and wrong on the subject of perseverance—I ask, can you conclude that a church wrong in all these points can be, and is, the church set forth in the word of God, established by Christ and his apostles? Surely, my dear friends, such a conclusion can not be formed, reasoning properly, from the facts and the principles that are here presented. We have shown in regard to the gentleman's church, that Mr. Wayland does not regard it as anything but a sect among other sects. We have quoted his very language, "a sect among other sects;" no more than this, according to the statement of Wayland in his principles and practices of the Baptists, a sect among other sects. And, so far as the great question of succession is concerned, Benedict affirms that they found no claim upon the succession; and Robinson affirms, and Benedict indorses it, that they only, who found their claim and their church upon tradition, and not upon the word of God, need the succession; and

this author affirms the same thing—that they fail who found their claims upon tradition, and not upon the word of God. Then we ask you to take all these facts, all these arguments against his church, and then take the final point that the gentleman has made, and I ask you, can you say that he has shown the characteristics which entitles his church to be regarded as the church of Christ? And one other point I had like to have forgotten. We find that Daniel says, the beast made war, and prevailed against the saints, in the 7th chapter of his prophecy. John says, in the 13th chapter, "the beast made war against the saints and overcame them," and they were for a time subdued, but this triumph on the part of the beast is not to be final—will not be the end of the kingdom. The church in the end will triumph over all opposition.—[TIME EXPIRED.]

BX
6331

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 496 950 4